INDIA

A Record and Review of Indian Affairs

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. VII., No. 2. (NEW SERIES.) FEBRUARY, 1896. Subscription, Post Free, SIX SHILLINGS PER ANN. IN INDIA, SIX RUPEES.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
Indiana: Notes on Indian Affairs	33
The Judiciary and the Executive in India:	
I.—By the Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse ..	39
II.—By the Right Hon. Sir Richard Couch	40
III.—By Sir Robert T. Reid, Q.C., M.P. ..	40
IV.—By Sir William Markby	41
V.—By Sir Raymond West	41
Uitlanders and India: The Mote and the Beam, by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P.	41
Wanted: Reform of the Councils	43
Lord Elgin at Madras	45
The Duty of Educated India: Speech by Mr. P. M. Mehta	46
The Congress at Poona	49
The President's Address	50
The Social Conference	52
A Challenge from Madras	54
Our London Letter	55
The Indian National Congress: Eleventh Session ..	57
,, ,, Text of the Resolutions	58
,, ,, "A Means of Learning Something"	61
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on the Crisis	62
Reviews: Poor India	62
A Gujarati Grammar	64
Bibliography of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects..	64

Indiana.

The Poona Congress. The proceedings of the eleventh Indian National Congress and of the Social Conference take up, in one form or another, a large part of our present issue. To print reports of the speeches was, of course, impossible, but we reproduce the text of the resolutions which were carried, together with a descriptive sketch of the proceedings from our Special Correspondent. Articles will also be found elsewhere dealing with Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji's presidential address, and the chief features both of the National Congress and of the Social Conference. We have endeavoured thus to present in concise form a general survey of the great annual assembly of educated India. The articles to which we have referred will gain by being read in connexion with Sir W. Wedderburn's article upon Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta's speech, and the extracts which we quote from the speech itself. It will be seen that one of the most important resolutions carried by the Congress urged once more the separation of judicial and executive functions. Upon this subject, in continuation of previous articles, we print the opinions of eminent authorities who have kindly consented to the publication of their statements in the Memorandum that is to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India.

Mr. Banerji on Finance. We deal elsewhere with the general features of the comprehensive address delivered by Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji as President of the Eleventh Congress. We may notice here the large portion of the address which deals with finance. Upon this subject, which undoubtedly lies at the root of India's difficulties, Mr. Banerji, representing as he does the universal sentiments of educated Indians, expressed himself with cogency and precision. The truth is that at present there is no effective check either in India or in the House of Commons upon the expenditure incurred by the Government of India. "If," Mr. Banerji said, "there is one thing more than another which English constitutional history impresses upon the mind of the reader, it is the zealous solicitude which the English people show at every stage of their history to ensure to their representatives, and to them alone, the full and absolute control over the finances of the country." On the other hand, the discussion of the Indian Budget is little more than a dismal farce. In India, members of Council may indeed discuss the Budget. But no resolution may be moved, no division may be taken, and the novel theory of the "mandate" lays down the doctrine that members must follow, not the dictates of their judgment, but the instructions of the Secretary of

State. The unreality of the discussion is even more marked in the House of Commons. The Indian Budget is presented as a foregone conclusion, it is discussed in a thin House at the eleventh hour of an expiring Session, and, even if the resolution that is submitted were not, as it is, purely formal, it is too late to remedy mischief which has been done. The results of this system are such as might be expected. Mr. Banerji summed up in a trenchant passage the financial history of the sixty years from 1834 to 1894. "During this period you have had," he said, "thirty-four years of deficit amounting in round numbers to 83 crores of rupees, and twenty-six years of surplus amounting to 42 crores of rupees in round numbers, with the net result that you have a net deficit of about 41 crores of rupees which make an average of deficit of something over 65 lakhs of rupees a year. Our debt kept pace with our deficit. They are twin sisters which march abreast. During the same period the public debt increased from 26 crores to 210 crores and 42 crores of this amount were incurred within the last ten years. If we are not bankrupts at any rate we are on the high road to bankruptcy." Yet the question which occupies the Government of India is not how to curtail unproductive, and especially military, expenditure but how to raise larger revenues to bury in the quicksands.

The Home Charges.

As for the Home Charges, Mr. Banerji pointed out that between 1882 and 1892 they had increased by more than 30 per cent. This is a subject which will occupy the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, and the members of that body will doubtless notice Mr. Banerji's complaint that charges are thrown upon India which should be borne, wholly or in part, by the British Treasury. "Charges," he said, "are thrown upon us which in the case of the free and independent colonies are borne by the Home Government. We paid £500,000 for the construction of the India Office in London. The Home Government paid £100,000 for the construction of the Colonial Office in London. Can anybody tell me why the Colonial Office cost £100,000 in the construction, and the India Office £500,000? Did it make any difference that the one was paid for out of our money and the other out of the money of the English taxpayer, who can look after his purse and can control the public expenditure? But let us proceed. We pay all the charges of the India Office in London amounting to £230,000 a year. The Home Government pays £41,000 for the Colonial Office in London. We pay £12,500 a year for the maintenance of the Chinese Legation, and £7,000 a year for the Persian Legation. The cost of the Residency in Turkish Arabia and of the Consulate in Bagdad, amounting to Rs.1,72,360, is entirely paid from the Indian revenues, as if England in her Imperial relations was in no way interested in their maintenance." The effect of such inequitable charges as these, combined as they are with continued extravagance in the Civil and Military departments of the Government of India, is, of course, to starve expenditure in directions in which it is urgently needed. Mr. Banerji cited, for example, some remarkable statistics showing how meagre is the expenditure on education in India compared with other countries. He finds that "while the expenditure on education per head of the population in Ceylon is over 2 ans., in Mauritius it is 10 ans., in Natal 1s. 3d., in British Guiana it is 1s. 11d., and even in Russia it is 3½d., in India it is only a little over 7 pies." How long will the supineness of British constituencies permit this scandal to continue?

Mr. Mehta's Speech.

We should like to think that the remarkable speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on December 20th will receive in this country, from members of Parliament and others, the careful attention which it so well deserves. The occasion was such as might well evoke the best qualities of so accomplishd an orator. The Indian community of Bombay thronged to the theatre to present to Mr. Mehta two addresses which had been voted to him some months before by the citizens of Bombay and by the delegates of the Eighth Bombay Provincial Conference. We learn from the Bombay newspapers that the meeting was thoroughly representative, and that so large an assembly had seldom been seen in the city. The addresses, voted to Mr. Mehta on his return from the sittings of the Imperial Legislative Council at Calcutta, testified in eloquent terms to the esteem and gratitude which his public services have won for him among all classes of his fellow-countrymen. Whether as the champion of municipal reform in Bombay, the advocate of higher education, or the vigilant critic of Imperial measures of a reactionary and repressive type, Mr. Mehta has never ceased in his efforts to "promote in every way the welfare of his countrymen and improve their political status. His name has been associated with most of the public movements in India during the past twenty-five years, and his services in the Imperial Legislative Council, especially in explaining the true causes of India's financial embarrassments, in defending healthy parliamentary interest in the affairs of India, and in resisting the odious provisions of such measures as the Police Amendment Bill, have marked him out as one of the most brilliant exponents of independent public opinion

Needless to say, Mr. Mehta has always taken a leading part in the work of the Indian National Congress and, as the delegates of the Provincial Conference point out, when that first great triumph of the Congress, the reform of the Legislative Councils, was obtained, he was chosen with one accord to be the representative of Bombay in the Local as well as the Imperial Councils.

The Task of Educated India.

Mr. Mehta's speech, which was received throughout with enthusiastic applause, may be described as an eloquent justification of the part which educated Indians are more and more tending to play, either as officials or as non-official critics, in the government of their country. With the modesty which is characteristic of him he accepted the addresses, not as a compliment personal to himself, but as setting forth "the motives which actuate the conduct of educated men throughout the country, the principles which guide their action, the credentials which they possess, and the constituents which they can, if not scientifically and systematically, at any rate really and substantially represent." It is fashionable in certain quarters to denounce as agitators or to ridicule as busybodies educated Indians who seek to represent the wants and wishes of the Indian people. Mr. Bhownaggree, whose pretensions have excited amusement in India, has joined in this chorus of vague and fatuous rebuke. Unfortunately, as Mr. Mehta showed in an entertaining anecdote, Mr. Bhownaggree appears to have held quite opposite opinions no long time ago. The people of India are merely bewildered by the attention which this versatile critic seems to receive in some circles. They have recognised only one Indian as having the right to make a representative claim for all India, namely, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji. Mr. Mehta spoke with enthusiasm of the advantages which have accrued to India from the spread of education. "From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone issued a band of noble youths, thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, to make the foreign rule of the country in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence a blessing to them both, instead of a curse." Nothing could be more absurd than to suggest that, because India is conservative, its administration cannot be improved. It is, as Mr. Mehta said, idle to talk of letting the aboriginal conservatism of India alone, for the simple reason that it is permeated already by the inevitable results of foreign rule. The problem is "how to reconcile them to a harmonious evolution," and this problem increasingly demands the watchful energies of educated Indians.

Bureaucratic "Aloofness."

Some Anglo-Indians appear to think, in the phrase of John Bright, that, having won India by breaking all the Ten Commandments, they cannot at this time of day begin to maintain it on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. The danger which Mr. Mehta perceives is not that the policy laid down in 1858 may be openly reversed, but that it will be insidiously evaded. British rule in India, however excellent it may be in many respects, is too secret, and the authorities are too little in touch with the people. Indeed, men like Sir Charles Elliott and Lord Harris appear to maintain that knowledge of public sentiments and needs resides solely and permanently in District Officers. It is the part of educated Indians to prevent the dangers which a bureaucratic system of this kind tends to produce. They know, as Englishmen can never know, the authentic wishes of the Indian peoples. They can speak their language, they mix freely among them, and, as Mr. Mehta put it, the hearts of the people are open to them as they can never be even to the most sympathetic officer. Heaven-born bureaucrats are fond of saying that educated Indians are a class apart, that they congregate in the large towns, and that they are utterly ignorant of the feelings and thoughts of the mass of the people. This statement has only one disadvantage, but it is a serious one. It is precisely the reverse of the truth. The majority of educated Indians are drawn from the small towns and villages, they have grown up in friendly contact with all sections of the agricultural and commercial classes, and they represent not only their own kith and kin but also a great body of public opinion which cannot at present find any other means of expression. This is specially true of the delegates who, taken together, constitute that unrivalled exponent of Indian opinion—the Indian National Congress. Mr. Mehta said a plain word about the native princes and chiefs. Undoubtedly they are in sympathy with the aims and objects of educated India, but "they do not always give open expresssion to their views for fear of displeasing their political officers who have it in their power to harass them in a hundred different ways." Men like Mr. Mehta are better representatives of Indian opinion than any political officers, and a Government which should wilfully close its ears against the advice and warnings of such counsellors

would be going out of its way to court disaster. Happily there is reason to believe that this ostrich-like policy is coming to be regarded with less and less favour by the Government of India.

Lord Reay and Lord Sandhurst.

Anglo-Indians who roundly abuse all independent Indian criticism of officials are, in fact, deprecating praise as well as blame. Public opinion in India is nothing if not discriminating. It does not by any means place all Anglo-Indian authorities in the same category with Sir Charles Elliott and Lord Harris. Lord Elgin, Liberal and Home Ruler though he is, has recently incurred some well-merited censure. But with Lord Sandhurst, the successor of Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay, the case is different. Mr. Mehta, for example, in the impressive speech from which we quote elsewhere, referred, amid loud cheers, to Lord Sandhurst's speeches as "distinguished by a genial and sympathetic tact which seems to win for his lordship all hearts wherever he goes." Similarly a Bombay correspondent writes to us under date December 20th :—"Lord Sandhurst yesterday unveiled the statue of Lord Reay, our former beloved Governor. After Elphinstone and Frere we have had no such Governor—a man of great culture, of stern rectitude, and of warm sympathy for Indians, who unswervingly upheld in practice, amid much obloquy from his own countrymen, the righteous principles laid down in the gracious proclamation of 1858. Lord Sandhurst made a speech which was not only full of just eulogy for his friend, but also expressed his own warm sympathy with the views of Lord Reay. Lord Sandhurst is extremely felicitous in his public utterances. His simplicity and engaging frankness at once kindles sympathy in the hearts of his hearers. In the speech which he delivered at the laying of the foundation-stone of the municipal offices at Karachi, he said candidly that a Governor's tour was not a mere show, but implied a desire to understand not only the public officials, but also enlighted non-official opinion." Is this the sort of criticism which, in Sir Charles Elliott's judgment, impairs the "prestige" of the Government of India?

The Cotton Duties.

The long expected readjustment of the Indian cotton duties has come at last, and it seems to have pleased nobody. Sir James Westland introduced in the Legislative Council at Calcutta on January 23rd two Bills providing for the total exemption of cotton yarns from import and excise duty, the reduction of the import duty on woven cottons from 5 to 3½ per cent., and the levying of an excise duty of 3½ per cent on goods woven in Indian mills. Sir James Westland, who has not hitherto been regarded as a humourist, protested against the bare notion that "the question in some way entered on a new phase or was in some way affected by the change of Ministry which took place in June last." He maintained that the policy of the Secretary of State, whether Lord George Hamilton or Sir Henry Fowler, had been "perfectly continuous" throughout. This is rather good. But it is not quite good enough. Sir Henry Fowler did, indeed, declare from the first that the cotton duties had, or should have, no protective effect. What Lord George Hamilton said last February was that the cotton duties were inexpedient and unjust, and that no excise duty could remove their injustice. He was then a private member. But he re-asserted his opinions in July as Secretary of State, and on the strength of them Conservative candidates triumphed throughout Lancashire. Yet Lord George Hamilton now has recourse to a general excise duty, in order to accomplish the purpose for which he then held, or stated, that an excise duty was useless. If this is continuous policy, there is no such thing as tergiversation. The result is that, while Lancashire manufacturers protest against the exemption of the products of hand-loom weaving in India, the Bombay millowners complain that the proposed alterations will reduce the duty on imported cotton goods from 125 to 88 lakhs, while the excise will be increased from 7 to 17½ lakhs—in other words, that the entire improvement in the finances of India is handed over to a reduction of the duties levied on Manchester goods. Meantime, the Indian taxpayer reflects, not without bitterness, that the salt tax is not reduced, although the Finance Minister, on his own admission, had 50 lakhs to spare.

A "Continuous" Policy!

It is interesting to contrast Mr. Balfour's references to the cotton duties, in his speech at Manchester on January 15th, with Lord George Hamilton's notorious speech of February last. Lord G. Hamilton declared, as we have seen, that the cotton duties were impolitic and inexpedient, unjust and unfair, and that a countervailing excise duty could not possibly remove the injustice. Mr. Balfour, whose candidature in East Manchester was aided last summer by Lord G. Hamilton's electioneering manifesto, declared that the Government would not fall behind its promises and expressions of intention. Its policy is, he said, "that as between Britain and India there shall be no protection either on one side or the other." Interpreting this remark by means of Lord G. Hamilton's formula, Sir W. H. Houldsworth, M.P., naturally inferred that the cotton duties were to be totally abolished. Mr. Balfour removed this erroneous inference, which

nevertheless illustrates once more the unscrupulousness with which many Conservatives have dealt with the whole question. The total abolition of the cotton duties, Mr. Balfour said, "is, for financial reasons, not at present possible. India must have money, and there is no other way to raise it than by a duty." If Lord G. Hamilton had said that last February, or written it last July, the representation of Lancashire in the House of Commons would be different from what it is. Undoubtedly Lancashire has suffered through the re-imposition of the duties. One has only to read such documents as the Annual Reports of the Weaver's Associations at Blackburn and Darwen in order to see that the complaints of Lancashire, though they may be exaggerated, are not without foundation. The pity of it is that Lancashire is apparently making little effort to understand or to remove the cause which led to the re-imposition of the duties. Mr. Balfour, who cultivates bimetallism as a student, though not as a Minister, roundly declared that it would never have been "needful to put an import duty at all in India upon Lancashire manufactures, had it not been for the unhappy fall in the gold value of silver." Has Mr. Balfour made any serious attempt to examine the facts? We have shown over and over again from the accounts of the Government of India that the chief cause of Indian financial embarrassment, and therefore of the re-imposition of the cotton duties, was not the fall in exchange, but extravagance in civil and military expenditure, and especially in the pursuit of the "forward" frontier policy. It would, no doubt, be unpleasant for Mr. Balfour to admit the truth of this proposition. He was one of the foremost advocates of the retention of Chitral, and he is a leading member of the party which invented the "forward" policy. But he may rest assured of one thing. So long as Lancashire electors return an overwhelming majority of representatives who support the "forward" military policy, they can expect to find little sympathy in India with their protests against the cotton duties.

In Praise of Publicity.

There was one remark in Mr. Balfour's speech at Manchester which the Government of India would do well to ponder. At the close of his references to the Venezuela question, he said, amid applause, "surely with all this mass of material before the public of both countries it will be hard indeed if the common sense of the Anglo-Saxon race is not able to settle any point in dispute without the arbitrament of war." It is satisfactory to find Mr. Balfour admitting so frankly that, as we have always contended, publicity, not secrecy, is the best policy in international affairs. Rarely has the British Government been occupied with such a complication of diverse troubles abroad. But it is significant that, where the public have been taken into the confidence of the Government, the clouds are lifting, while the policy of secrecy and silence has been attended by unqualified failure. The prospect has greatly improved in the Transvaal business, where Mr. Chamberlain has worked openly, and in the Venezuela business, where President Cleveland's Message made the people of both countries the assessors of their Governments in determining the points at issue. But in the case of the Armenian question, where secrecy has been maintained for many years and by both parties, especially in the suppression of the Consular Reports, there is hardly a gleam of light and hope. The moral should not be lost upon bureaucrats. It is far easier for an individual Minister, however cordially he may detest the horrors of war, to bring about hostilities than it is for two peoples to enter upon war with full knowledge and of set purpose. In Indian affairs in particular we see some of the worst fruits of bureaucratic secrecy. The protracted series of diplomatic manœuvres which is known as the "forward" frontier policy and which, from timo to time, finds vent in such an incident as the recent fighting in Chitral, is essentially a secret thing, and the machinations of which it consists could not stand the light of public knowledge. It depends upon the suppression of State papers, and the bowdlerisation of Blue-Books. To disclose it fully would be to destroy it, and to disgrace its authors and agents. It thrives in darkness, and apparently both political parties in the United Kingdom are content that it should so thrive. Lord Rosebery may complain on public platforms that the Chitral Blue-Book was too carefully edited. But if Sir H. Fowler had heeded the repeated requests of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, the most important documents would have been public property before his successor was appointed. Mr. Balfour admits the value of publicity under representative institutions, where members and Ministers can be called to account. It is not less, but more, necessary under a bureaucratic Government, where irresponsible officials are only too easily guided by their own sweet will.

The Finance Commission.

It is an open secret that the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, which will shortly resume its investigations at the India Office, has hitherto been occupied chiefly, if not exclusively, with what may be described as the financial machinery of the Government of India, as distinguished from the progress of expenditure, and the apportionment of charge between India and the United Kingdom. The

proclamation appointing the Commission expressly contemplated the issue of *interim* reports, and such a subject as financial machinery obviously lends itself to separate treatment. The evidence which has been taken by the Commission is, in pursuit of a policy which we have always deplored, withheld from the public. But it is inconceivable that some, at any rate, of the financial experts who have been called should not have strengthened the demands and representations consistently put forward by educated Indians and British advocates of Indian reform. So far as financial machinery is concerned, those representations have always emphasised the absence of any real and effective check upon Indian expenditure. Such a check is not to be found either in India or in the House of Commons, and it is not surprising that, as we show elsewhere, a large part of the Presidential Address at the Poona Congress was taken up with a discussion of the dangers which ensue from this want of control, and with a contrast between the popular management of national expenditure in this country and the uncontrolled liberty of bureaucratic officials, and especially the heads of spending departments, in India. It may not, perhaps, be strictly accurate to say that there is no check upon Indian expenditure. The mischief is that the checks which exist on paper are so unreal and illusory as to be worse than useless. They suggest the performance of functions which are really neglected and which, but for them, could not be neglected without notice.

Wanted: Effective Control.

That the existing checks upon Indian expenditure are ineffective and illusory is due partly, of course, to the essentially official character of the Government of India, but partly also to arrangements based upon a false analogy between the systems of financial administration in India and the United Kingdom respectively. The Exchequer Audit Act, for example, is useful enough in England, where the Comptroller and Accountant General is backed up by a representative House of Commons, to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer is responsible. The Act provides effective machinery by which the taxpayers can exercise a revisionary control over financial administration. But to transplant the same system to India is by no means to accomplish the same purpose. On the contrary, it probably means in India little more than to invite one part of the official machine to supervise the work of another part of the official machine, and to supervise it with results which have already been obtained as a matter of daily routine. The salt of contact with the taxpayers themselves, or with the House of Commons as representing the Indian taxpayers, is wanting. There can be no greater mistake than to underrate the personal influence of the Viceroy. It makes, in the Aristotelian phrase, not merely some difference but all the difference whether he is disposed to support the desire of the Finance Minister for economy or the desire of the spending departments, and especially the overgrown and over-represented military department, for expenditure. As for the discussion of the Budget, it is at present, as Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji shows anew, little better than a mere farce alike in India and in the House of Commons.

The Moderation of India.

What is wanted is to secure real connecting links between the people who find the money and the authorities who disburse it. Adequately to accomplish this end would obviously involve an effective system of popular representation in India. The moderate demands of educated Indians are, however, content for the present to propose a much simpler modification of the existing machinery. They ask, so far as control in India is concerned, that the Legislative Councils may be enlarged and made more truly representative, and that amendments and divisions may be permitted in discussions upon the Budget. As regards control on this side, they ask that the India Council, until it is abolished, may be reinforced by representative Indians; that the debate in the House of Commons upon the Indian Budget may be transformed from a perfunctory sham into a living reality by the previous, regular and thorough information of the House through a Standing Committee, which shall consider not merely the cut-and-dried statement of the Finance Minister, but also the debates in the Viceroy's Council and the dissents of members either of that Council or of the India Council; and last, but not least, that the salary of the Secretary of State for India may be placed upon the British Estimates, and that he, equally with his colleagues in the Ministry, may "face the music" of effective criticism at the hands of Parliament. In other words, so far as financial machinery is concerned, the problem before the Royal Commission is permanently to ally the knowledge of financial experts in the Government of India with the authority of the House of Commons, and to permeate and vivify both the one and the other by real contact and sympathy with the wishes of the Indian people. We hope that Lord Welby and his colleagues will rise to the occasion.

The Outlook Abroad.

Shortly after the present Government was formed, Mr. Balfour observed that its difficulties would probably arise not in domestic affairs but in international relations. The outlook abroad suggests that Mr. Balfour was

a true prophet, though it remains to be seen whether the many classes of electors who received lavish promises from Unionist candidates last summer will therefore consent to be put off. The New Year came in amid the gravest anxieties. Already the difficulty between Great Britain and the United States with reference to Venezuela had been added to the Armenian problem, which Lord Salisbury's Government inherited from its predecessor. The beginning of the year brought the news of Dr. Jameson's outrageous attack upon the Transvaal. This remarkable incursion, like President Cleveland's Message, afforded Continental critics of the United Kingdom a congenial opportunity which they utilized to the full. The *Times* of January 18th printed under the title, "England's Enemies" a letter from "A Foreigner," expressing his astonishment "on finding that not only Americans, Turks and Boers, but nearly all the nations of Europe and Asia manifest great animosity towards Great Britain." The intelligent foreigner asked himself the cause of these things, and his answer suggests the question, To which foreign nation does he himself belong? For it is, he thinks, primarily "envy and jealousy" which make England "hated and feared." Germany, France, and Russia are annoyed to see us "bringing forward extraordinary and salutary changes in the social and political conditions in distant, wild, and semi-civilized nations." Germany, in particular, has "fallen into the vice of self-admiration" and cannot bear to be reminded of "the ubiquity of the Union Jack." Also, our Government is credited with having stirred up the Armenian question with ulterior designs. On the whole, it is a not unflattering picture, and the intelligent foreigner was rewarded for his moderation with the largest type on the leading page. At the same time it is just possible that there are other foreigners who dislike England, not because they are jealous of her virtues, but because they seem to perceive in us qualities that we should describe as covetousness and a desire for aggression in Germans or Russians. That little affair of the Viceroy's Proclamation in the Chitral campaign, for example, produced a certain impression upon many minds, especially as Mr. Balfour argued in public that our "prestige" demanded violation of our word.

England, France, and Siam.

The dispute between France and England about the Upper Mekong Valley has at last been settled. Lord Salisbury, who was once described as "a lath painted to look like iron," has come to terms with France, and the terms are such as no Frenchman could have refused. In other words, France has obtained everything. The Mekong will henceforth be the boundary of the French possessions up to the Chinese frontier, Lord Rosebery's theory of the "buffer State" goes by the board, the British garrison at Mongsin is to be at once withdrawn, and Siam becomes subject to a French protectorate. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says that the settlement "does not look promising," while the *Observer* opines that it is "simply amazing." We have yet to learn the opinion of that distinguished traveller, author and statesman, Mr. George Nathaniel Curzon, whom, for the moment, it seems to have paralysed into unusual silence. It is said that Lord Salisbury's concession is but an outward and visible sign of a general understanding with France. If so, the Conservative party, who have hitherto cultivated Germany with diplomatic passion, have modified their theory of European relations. Will the new understanding, if there is one, extend to a discussion of the Egyptian question? Meantime, there are those who ask what the Siamese think of the arrangement, and whether we have disposed of their territory without obtaining their consent. Perhaps Mr. Curzon will throw light upon these matters in the speech in which he announces his resignation. He has declared, in season and out of season, that the future of the British Empire depended upon resistance to French encroachments in Siam. But Mr. Curzon has declared so many things, especially about the British Empire, and perhaps Lord Salisbury agrees with the *Daily News* that "the future of our Indian Empire depends upon the wisdom of her rulers, and not upon the ownership of Luang Prabang."

THE JUDICIARY AND THE EXECUTIVE IN INDIA.

In continuation of our previous articles on this subject, we print below a series of important expressions of opinion by eminent authorities. These statements will be incorporated in the Memorandum which is shortly to be submitted to the Secretary of State for India.

I.—By the Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse.

The Right Hon. Lord Hobhouse, Legal Member of the Viceroy's Council 1872-77, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and of the Quorum of the House of Lords for Judicial Purposes, etc., etc., etc., writes:—

I have received the papers you send for the purpose of effecting further separation between purely executive and administrative functions on the one hand and judicial ones on the other.

I have been for many years detached from Indian affairs, and cannot speak with confidence, or even with accuracy, on points of internal government,

which must turn on details. I do not even know whether such changes as have been made in the Civil Service since the Criminal Procedure Code of 1872 or the Civil Procedure Code of 1877, or, indeed, whether the working of those Codes, and of the Courts Acts which dovetail with them, have tended in the direction of further separation or the contrary. So far as your general aims and objects go, you have my strong sympathy. I have, however, nothing to say except generalities which I uttered many times in speech and writing since my return from India in 1877. It has always seemed to me that the substitution of a fixed impersonal law for the personal views of the ruler for the time being, and in the particular case, is one of the most important advances in good government that can be made in any country; and, again, that this advantage cannot be secured unless the law is declared by a separate staff of functionaries. How far the separation shall be carried, so as to secure the utmost amount of independence in the judiciary that is consistent with the unity and stability of government, is a question of statesmanship depending on the condition of the country. I believe that under Asiatic rulers the principle of independence was so merged in that of unity as to be very weak, even if perceptible. And I have always claimed for our countrymen that we have either introduced it or made it a living thing. In the course of my work as Law Member of Council, I held many conversations and discussions with Bengal zemindars and with nobles and landholders in other parts of India, and, rightly or wrongly, I came to the belief that they had grasped the principle of judicial independence firmly and put a true value upon it, and looked on it as a great safeguard. And in answer to the common superficial sneer about our beer-bottles, I have said, among other things, that if we were separated from India we should leave an active and working conception of law, which did not exist before our time, and which is one of the most potent contributions to the framework of a nation.

I do not know whether my colleagues took such strong views as I as to the value of an independent judiciary; nor do I think that any event in my time called for its discussion in a crucial shape, such as brings out conflicts of opinion. But it was, I think, generally assumed to be good, except for very backward and primitive parts of India; and the objections to making it more complete were mainly on the score of expense. In fact, as regards civil suits, where the litigants bear the expense in the shape of court fees, the separation is perhaps as fully effected as need be; and I understand that your present demand is not grounded on any mischief felt in civil suits. With regard to criminal proceedings, I think the general view among high officials was—it certainly was mine—that more ought to be done when the means were forthcoming. I gather from your papers that contrary views are now in the ascendant.

These general views are all that I can express. It is a very long way to descend from them to particulars, and to say that the circumstances of the day not only demand, but render possible, a further extension of independent judiciary. I think it likely, and you have my hearty sympathy with your aims. But beyond that, and it is very little, I cannot help you.

II.—By the Right Hon. Sir Richard Couch.

The Right Hon. Sir Richard Couch, Chief Justice of Bengal, 1870-75, Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, etc., etc., writes:

I am obliged to you for sending me the January number of your journal, "India," and the print of the interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose. The latter discloses a state of things which certainly ought not to exist. Judicial and executive authority and functions are incompatible. It is essential to the proper administration of justice that the judicial officers of the Government should not be subject to such a trial of the independence and sense of duty as appears there. The facts stated by Mr. Ghose have mostly occurred during the last twenty years, when I had ceased to hold any judicial office in India, and I cannot from my own knowledge give any opinion upon the action of the executive officers during that time. Mr. Ghose says: "In the olden days the Executive were in the habit of loyally accepting the decisions of judicial tribunals." This, according to my recollection, agrees with my experience in India. "But," he continues, "within the last twenty years there has been a manifest tendency to put pressure upon our judicial tribunals to decide cases according to the wishes of the Executive." As regards this, I am unable to believe, with Sir Richard Garth, that the Government of India approves it and would be sorry to see it altered. I think every practicable effort to preserve the independence of the judicial tribunals in India should be made, and trust that your proposed publication of Mr. Ghose's paper and a subsequent representation to the India Office will have due effect.

III.—By Sir Robert T. Reid, Q.C., M.P.

Sir Robert T. Reid, Q C., M.P., Attorney-General in the late Liberal Administration, etc., etc., writes:—

I do not know in detail the manner in which, or the extent to which, Judicial and Executive duties are discharged in India by the same persons, and therefore I could not without much more information than I at present possess offer any criticism upon your scheme.

But I certainly consider that it is most unadvisable in any country for the same person to act as a judge and as an officer of the executive government. However scrupulous and careful a man may be, it must be very difficult at times to reconcile such different functions, and in case of abuse of power the evil consequences of such a dual authority might be incalculable. The thing is not allowed in England and every man who has read history ought to hope that it will disappear in India.

IV.—BY SIR WILLIAM MARKBY.

Sir William Markby, late Judge of the High Court, Calcutta, Reader in Indian law in the University of Oxford, etc., writes :—

I have read Mr. Manomohan Ghose's memorandum with attention, and it only confirms the view which I have always held, and which is, I should suppose, held by everyone who has had any experience in the administration of justice, that the union in the same person of Judicial and Executive functions always leads to injustice.

In Mr. Ghose's memorandum matters are touched upon which do not quite strictly belong to this subject. But the evil, I take it, upon which he desires to mainly insist, and which he desires to see remedied, is this : that magistrates who are responsible for the peace of a district, whose duty it is to initiate criminal proceedings, and who are, in fact, virtually police officers, also exercise large and preponderating judicial powers in the same district.

That magistrates should have failed to exercise satisfactorily functions so entirely opposed to each other as those of policeman and judge is not at all surprising. It would have been a miracle had it been otherwise. The zeal in procuring a conviction which is the first duty of a policeman is absolutely inconsistent with the impartiality of a judge.

That there are miscarriages of justice arising from this unfortunate union of functions, and that these miscarriages of justice do great harm as tending to shake the confidence of the people in the administration of justice itself, I have no doubt whatever.

I would, therefore, gladly see the magistrates of all grades relieved entirely of all duties other than those which are purely judicial, and also see them made responsible for the performance of their judicial duties to the Sessions Judge and to the High Court, and not in any way to the District Magistrate or to the Commissioner.

Such a change would save many of the evils suggested by the memorandum of Mr. Ghose, and as it only involves a transfer of functions without any increase of work, I cannot see why it should involve any increase of expenditure.

If there is any reason to suppose that the system might be ineffectual for the repression of crime it might be tried as an experiment in one of the districts adjoining Calcutta. It seems hardly likely that a system which succeeds perfectly well in that city would be a failure if tried in the immediate neighbourhood.

V.—BY SIR RAYMOND WEST.

Sir Raymond West, late Judge of the High Court, Bombay, etc., writes :—

I am keenly alive to the disadvantages that arise from the combination of executive and magisterial functions. We should not get rid of all difficulties or secure absolutely perfect justice by a severance of the duties, but we should remove many temptations to abuse, which may not always be overcome, and many grounds for suspicion and misrepresentation. Ten years ago, or thereabouts, I wrote a letter to Lord Dufferin, in which I insisted on the necessity for a gradual reform, and pointed out how, in my opinion, it could be effected. He sent me a courteous and appreciative answer, but nothing was done. The Government, strongly executive in feeling, are no doubt wholly opposed to a change, which they think would weaken the hands of the general administration. They are conscious themselves of a strong desire for the people's welfare, and not without reason credit the local officers with similar wishes. But seeing certain material conveniences in the present system, and naturally loving what is called strong government, they ignore the underlying moral weakness of the system—its incapacity to command complete respect and confidence.

UITLANDERS AND INDIA: THE MOTE AND THE BEAM.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

We have before us this week two important and characteristic speeches bearing on the claims and destiny of subject races. At Manchester the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour has lectured the Boer rulers of the Transvaal on their duty towards the 50,000 disfranchised Uitlanders of the Rand; at Bombay the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta pleads with the British rulers of India for political justice towards the 250 millions of his unrepresented fellow countrymen.

In his Manchester speech Mr. Balfour bases his argument on a political axiom, which corresponds with the doctrine in mechanics of stable and unstable equilibrium. Referring to the position of the Uitlanders, he lays down the proposition that a State cannot possess the elements of stability and permanent prosperity if the vast majority of the inhabitants, who pay the greater proportion of the taxes, are allowed no share whatever in the government of the country. Yet curiously enough, it does not seem to occur to him that this pernicious condition of unstable equilibrium is exactly the state of affairs we try to maintain, on so exaggerated a scale, in India. This is what he says : "In the opinion of this Government . . . . it is quite impossible, human nature being what it is, that matters shall ever be satisfactory in the Transvaal so long as the system of government there is founded on so artificial . . . . and so inequitable a basis. It is not possible from what we know of the working of human beings, from what we know of the character of the Uitlanders as they are called—the English, Americans, and Germans, who form the great community of Uitlanders in the Transvaal State—it is not possible, knowing what we do of the traditions in which these men

have been brought up and of their character, to suppose that any State in which they form the vast majority—not merely the majority but the vast majority—in which they pay by far the greater proportion of taxes, but in which they are allowed no particle of authority, no particle of share in the government of the country—I say it is impossible that a State so constituted could be a State possessing the elements of stability and permanent prosperity." What could be better than this homily, as a modern instance to illustrate an ancient parable? It is indeed a quaint exhibition of insular self-assurance, this British statesman offering to remove the mote from President Kruger's eye, while seemingly unconscious of the enormous beam in his own.

But let us pass on to the practical part of the parable: and invite the right hon. gentleman to cast out the beam which is in his own eye, by making reasonable political concessions to that vast majority in India, who pay the taxes, but are allowed no particle of authority or share in the government of their own country. Perhaps it may be objected that, in stating the general proposition, Mr. Balfour meant to limit its application to those possessing the traditions and character of the Uitlanders? Quite true. But I would ask, in what respect are the people of India, inhabiting their own native land, less deserving of consideration than the congregation of foreign adventurers who have voluntarily migrated to the Transvaal, in the pursuit of wealth? What is there in the traditions and character of the Uitlanders which entitles them to Mr. Balfour's special sympathy? Is it their impatience; their violent language; their conspiracy against established authority; their secret importation of revolvers, rifles, and Maxim guns? I am glad to think that such a course of conduct forms no part of the traditions or character of the Indian people, and I regret that it should be indicated to them, by so high an authority, as the path leading to political privileges. Under the guidance of their educated brethren, their methods have hitherto been purely constitutional. For more than ten years, meeting annually in their National Congress, the Indian people have, in moderate and respectful language, sought redress for their many grievances; setting forth in definite shape the practical reforms needed for the general welfare. Surely under these circumstances the ruling power ought to do one of two things: it ought either to give a careful hearing to these complaints; or else it should concede to such a patient and law-abiding people some little share in the management of their own affairs, so that they may redress their grievances for themselves. But no; our marvellous policy is to refuse to do either one thing or the other. Doubtless the second alternative is the better one, to give the people some voice in their own affairs; but that has not been adopted; although Mr. Balfour most truly points out that where the great mass of the people are allowed no particle of authority, no particle of share in the government, neither stability nor permanent prosperity are possible. Political concessions are apparently to be reserved for those who possess the traditions and character of the Johannesburg Uitlanders. But if the absence of such traditions and character disentitles the people of India to any share of self-government, and if in their simplicity they cling to constitutional methods, surely that is not a reason for refusing the other alternative, viz., a kindly hearing to their representations? Yet, strange to say, this is the course of action which commends itself to the Indian officials. Year after year these representations are treated with contemptuous neglect; while the Congress leaders, the men who, at great personal sacrifice and with much labour, have rendered the movement truly representative, and have kept it strictly within constitutional lines, are pursued with unceasing insult and ridicule. Verily, the fatuous perversity of such a method of ruling a great empire is enough to make Nicholas Macchiavelli turn in his grave.

The true aims and objects of educated Indians have been well stated by the Hon. Mr. Mehta in the eloquent speech at Bombay, to which I have already referred. The main points of that speech are reproduced on another page, and I would earnestly commend its perusal to those who wish to understand the sentiment which animates the educated class in India. Their desire is to become the interpreters between the British Government and the masses of their fellow countrymen. Firmly persuaded that in the British connection, in the reawakening which follows the culture and science of the west, lie the brightest hopes of their race, they desire so to mould the British administration that it may become a national one, by the force of national approval and national support. As Mr. Mehta says, it is the gift of higher education, freely and generously bestowed in a past generation by men like Mountstuart Elphinstone and Lord Macaulay, that has inspired an unselfish devotion to the welfare of India combined with attachment to British rule: "From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone, issued a band of noble youths thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, in making the foreign rule of the country, in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, a blessing to them both, instead of a curse." Sad it is indeed when British officials, belonging to a later and less heroic generation, feel no desire to foster and perpetuate such sentiments, and can only regard the educated leaders with jealous dislike. A distinguished minister of the late Czar once lamented this purblind condition of the bureaucracy in his own country: "Unfortunate country!"—he wrote to a friend, "Will ever the happy day come when a Russian, like a citizen of any other country, will be allowed openly and freely to express his views, his convictions, his opinions upon men and things without running the risk of being proclaimed a revolutionist and an enemy of law and order?" Similarly we may say of India, "Unfortunate country!—will ever the happy day come when an Indian can tell the Government the plain unvarnished truth without having his

integrity questioned and his motives misrepresented?"

Among the younger generation of Indian public men there is no one more competent than Mr. Mehta to speak on behalf of the people of India. As a barrister of wide practice; as the Chairman for many years of the Bombay Municipality; and as an elected Member of the Viceroy's Council, he has experience of every phase of life among his fellow countrymen, whether social, municipal, or political; and in every one of these departments he has been found a fearless and eloquent advocate of progress and reform. This was well expressed by the delegates who on the present occasion met in Bombay to present him with an Address of confidence: "We have met here," they said, "as representatives of the Native public of this Presidency, and we deem it our duty to signify to you and to the public at large, as well as to the Government, our unabated confidence in you as a representative leader and spokesman of this Presidency, and as the chosen advocate of the Indian people in the Councils of the Empire." Surely, in the interests of good Government, we should listen to the warnings of men of this type, and cultivate their friendship. Among foreign nations at present we seem to have no friends; and all the more necessary is it that we should be on cordial terms with these of our own household. Especially is this the case as regards India, which, with its boundless resources, must be to us a tower of strength if we have the people with us, but, if we alienate their affections, must be a source of weakness and danger. No great sacrifice is necessary in order to secure the goodwill of this great, docile, and industrious people. What is asked for is the fulfilment of promises already given; a little attention to practical grievances; a more kindly and sympathetic attitude; or at least a a cessation from needless attacks and insults directed against the persons and aspirations most dear to them. Considering the vast importance of a friendly India, it seems a strange thing that the semi-official Anglo-Indian Press should exhaust its energies in promoting ill-will. Even at this inopportune moment there seems to be special activity in this direction; for Mr. Mehta has to complain of "a remarkable recrudescence of calumny, misrepresentation and resentment against all those natives who venture, however humbly, to take an active interest in the welfare and progress of their country."

Can we not give up this habit of lecturing, scolding, and abusing our neighbours? Such conduct is not admired in an individual. Why should we adopt it as a nation? It is neither dignified nor profitable. By some means or another we have so managed our affairs that we do not possess a single friend among the nations of the world. And this state of things suggests a little self-examination. We may be altogether in the right, a sort of latter-day Aristides, and all the rest of the world wrong. But it would be well to make sure that this is the case. There is a Scotch story of a girl and her lover, which seems to be in point. Jock was in the volunteers, and she went with her mother to admire him at his drill, but when the regiment marched past something evidently was wrong, and she cried out "Oh, mither, mither, look! the hale regiment is oot o' step wi' oor Jock!" Something of this sort appears to have happened to us at present. We seem to be out of step with the rest of the world. Would it not be a good thing to get into step with the 250 millions of our Indian fellow subjects, who are only too anxious to march along side of us, if we will only allow them to do so?

WANTED: REFORM OF THE COUNCILS.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Among the burning questions which are exercising the minds of those interested in the advancement of India, the expansion and reform of the Legislative and Provincial Councils finds a prominent place, and this, too, though it was only in 1892 that the Indian Councils Amendment Act was passed, by which some valuable concessions were made to the public demand. Those to whom this boon was granted are anything but satisfied. For years past there had been an ever increasing demand that some at least of the members of the Councils should be elected by the people, and it was with this proviso that Mr. Bradlaugh introduced his Bill into the House of Commons. The British Government, finding itself hard pressed, thought it advisable to bring in a Bill having for its object the expansion of the Councils, and obtained precedence for it, thus putting Mr. Bradlaugh's Bill into the background. The Government measure passed into law, and, though it is much to be regretted that it did not in express terms introduce the elective system as regards the non-official members to be appointed to the Council, it must in justice be admitted that the English Legislature approved of the adoption of the principle of election, but left it to the Viceroy to frame rules which would ensure the direct representation of the people in the Councils. When the Bill was being discussed in the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone, referring to the opinions of Lords Northbrook, Ripon, and Dufferin, all ex-Viceroys, made the following remarks:

"These men have entirely exempted themselves from whatever prejudices administration may have entailed on them, and they have distinctly and deliberately sanctioned the introduction of the elective principle. It is there that we stand upon solid ground, and Her Majesty's Government ought to understand that it will be regarded as a grave disappointment if, after all the assurances we have received that an attempt will be made to bring into operation this powerful engine of Government, there should not be some result such as we anticipate. I do not speak of its amount, I speak more of its quality."

Mr. Gladstone went on to say:

"I believe we are justified in looking forward not merely to a nominal but to a real living representation of the people of India."

As if to clear up any remaining doubts, he added:

"My construction of the Under-Secretary's speech (I do not think it will admit of any other construction) is, that it implies that in the opinion of the Government and of the House of Lords a serious effort should be made to consider carefully those elements which in the present condition of India might furnish material for the introduction into the Councils of the elective principle."

The Under Secretary of State accepted the construction put by Mr. Gladstone upon the intentions of the Government in introducing this Bill, and said:—

"I need only say, in conclusion, that I entirely accept the statement of the right hon. gentleman as to the objects with which this Bill is introduced."

That sentiments so clearly expressed should have raised high the hopes of the Indian people was only to be expected. But they were soon disillusionized. Lord Lansdowne may have been actuated by good intentions. Indeed, he quoted with approval, in his speech in the Legislative Council, the following words of Mr. Gladstone's:—

"I am not disposed to ask of the Governor-General or of the Secretary of State that they shall at once produce large and imposing results. What I wish is that their first step shall be of a genuine nature, and that whatever scope they give to the elective principle shall be real."

The outcome of this speech was, however, most disappointing and illusory, the rules were framed in an illiberal and narrow spirit, and the line of conduct subsequently adopted by the Government of India and the subordinate officials has the appearance of being actuated by a desire to render nugatory the privileges granted to the people.

In some quarters there is now a desire to agitate for the repeal of the Indian Councils Amendment Act, 1892, and to press upon Parliament the necessity of passing another Act more liberal and explicit in its provisions. This would be a most impolitic step. It would be a total misapplication of our time and energy. By years of continuous agitation we obtained this amending Act, and it will take years before we obtain another. The object we have in view is more likely to be attained, and at an earlier date, if we direct our attention to the amendment of the rules framed by the Viceroy and ask that they may be administered in a more sympathetic spirit. What are our objections? They may be summarised as follows:—

(i) Though certain important bodies have been allowed to elect their representatives to the Councils, the people at large are by no means sufficiently represented;

(ii) The mode of election is defective with respect to the few seats reserved for the representatives of the people;

(iii) An almost undisguised attempt is made to restrain the freedom of speech of members and to restrict the right of interpellation;

(iv) The introduction of the doctrine of mandate fetters the action of members by making it obligatory on them to vote, not according to their consciences, but according to instructions received from the Secretary of State for India.

(i) The complaint as to the paucity of popular representatives comes from every one of the four Provincial Councils. Each Local Government framed its own rules under the sanction of the Government of India, and it seems as if the officials feared at the outset that, by increasing the number of seats to which members would be elected by the people, they would thereby open the door to men who would be beyond their control and influence. To take one Province—the Bombay Presidency—as an example. The Councils Act of 1892 gave eight seats for which recommendations could be made for nomination by the Government. They were distributed as follows: 1. The Bombay University; 2. The Municipal Corporation of Bombay; 3. Bombay Chamber of Commerce; 4. Karachi Chamber of Commerce; 5. Sirdars of the Deccan; 6. Zemindars of Sind; 7 and 8. General Public. We find here that whilst for the classes numbering, say, about 5,000, six seats are reserved, to the masses numbering 19,000,000, only two seats are allotted. The Bombay Chamber of Commerce and the Karachi Chamber of Commerce are composed entirely of Europeans and would, as a general rule, take the official view of questions coming up before the Council. The Sirdars of the Deccan and the Zemindars of Sind are subservient to the Government and would never dream of offending it. Their representatives would be safe to vote with the officials, who thus by their curious distribution of the seats practically secure a majority of the votes of the members who are supposed to be elected. In two of the provinces the university vote may be counted upon by the Government, for the majority of the electors are Europeans and would, of course, send a European to represent them. To any unprejudiced mind it will be clear that it was never the intention of Parliament that the distribution of the seats should be so manipulated by the Government as to secure for itself most of the votes of the so-called elected members.

(ii) The mode of election of the members supposed to represent the people is intrinsically defective. The Municipalities and District Boards of a Province are divided into two groups respectively, and each group is allowed alternately to elect a member to represent it in the Council. This plan would not be open to objection if these Municipalities and District Boards were representative of the people. But they are not. Both of these bodies are often composed of members nominated by the Government, and sometimes of members who may be divided into three classes:—official, nominated, and elected, with a chairman who is usually an official. It invariably happens that the official and nominated members (who are, of course subservient to the Government) constitute a majority. Hence it naturally follows that only such persons are elected by the Municipalities and District Boards as are in favour with the Government. It has occasionally happened that the District Officers have openly brought pressure to bear, in order to secure the election of their nominees, even going to the length of taking advantage of their position as chairmen to get themselves elected as of the delegates to whom is left the final election of the member who is to represent them. Again, while all the District Boards take part in such elections, this privilege is conferred on only some of the Municipalities. In the North-Western Provinces, for instance, only 20 out of 103 Municipalities have the franchise. That an election on such a basis should rouse discontent is not to be wondered at. When Mr. Bradlaugh introduced his Bill it contained a proviso that the franchise should be conferred on at least 2 per cent. of the total

population of the Province, which would have been satisfactory. The Government has now two alternatives before it. If it is really desirous to secure an election by the people which would not be open to objection, it should confer the franchise with due qualifications on the people to elect a representative direct to the Council. Or if it desires, as at present, to leave the election in the hands of the Municipalities and District Boards, it should permit only the elected members on these corporate bodies to record their votes, which would of course necessitate the increase in some Municipalities, and the appointment in others where there are none, of elected members. The officials ought on no account to take part in these proceedings. Apart from the instances which have, of late, frequently occurred of officials trying their utmost to secure the return of their nominee, the mere fact of their being interested in a particular person is liable to influence unduly the minds of the electors.

(iii) Restraint on the freedom of speech and restriction of the right of interpellation. Recent events have borne out the oft-repeated statement that nominated members could not feel or be credited with that amount of independence which it is essential that they should enjoy. It was too much to expect them to criticise the actions of the very men who brought them into existence. With the introduction of a new class of men under the elective system the Government officials should have been prepared to face public criticism, to which no doubt they were not accustomed; and though they might have good reason to smart under such criticism it was hardly expected that they would resent it as they have done. The Hon. Mr. Mehta, in the discussion on the Police Amendment Bill, expressed himself strongly as to the extreme undesirability of investing officials, "under cover of executive measures for the preservation of order, with the power of convicting and punishing without judicial trial;" and he alluded to the prejudices to which all men are liable and from which even the heaven-born civilian is not exempt. For this he was sternly taken to task by Sir J. Westland, who accused him of calumniating "the most distinguished service in the world," and of lowering the reputation of the august assembly he was addressing. In the Provincial Councils the same spirit is shown, but in another direction. Sir Charles Elliott gave the start by raising objections to some of the interpellations of the members of his Council, and innocently suggested that some of the desired information might have been obtained privately from the secretaries, entirely ignoring the fact that publicity was most wanted, and that a hundred answers to questions put "on the quiet" to the secretaries would not possess the same value as one obtained in open Council, which would have the advantage of publicity. Surely we are entitled to ask our rulers to be a little more sympathetic and generous in their action.

(iv) The doctrine of the Mandate. The officials who compose the Viceroy's Council are no doubt members of the most distinguished service in the world, but they seem likely to be more distinguished for some of the extraordinary opinions they hold as to how they are to discharge their duties. Sir H. Brackenbury, in the discussion on the Cotton Duties, said: "There is a difference between those members who have been appointed by His Excellency as additional members and those members of the Council who held their seats by virtue of their being ordinary members," and who, he added, having received definite instructions from the Secretary of State, were bound to carry out those instructions. The Viceroy went further, and swept away this distinction. He said:

"It is claimed that members must be free to speak and vote in this Council for the measure they honestly think best. I can accept that proposition only with the qualification that they duly recognise the responsibility under which they recieve their rights in this Council. . . . . Every man who sits here sits by the authority of Parliament, and to say that he can refuse to obey the decisions of Parliament would be absurd. . . . . The Secretary of State interprets the will of Parliament, and I protest against our—I will not say obedience to, but rather—acceptance of his decision by anything less than ungrudging assent."

Paraphrased in simple language these words amount to the assertion that both ordinary and additional members of Council are bound to carry out the behests of the Secretary of State. If it is so, then why go through the farce of electing members, and why have any discussion at all in the Council, when all that that august body has to do is to register the decrees of the Secretary of State?

LORD ELGIN AT MADRAS.

[From a Madras Correspondent.]

Viceregal tours in India are losing all their importance. Popular enthusiasm ran high when Lord Ripon paid his visit to Madras. For over six miles triumphal arches were erected, and vast crowds ranged on both sides of the road through which the Viceroy passed, bands playing and banners flying. On the place of landing, His Excellency received the municipal address and the people's address. He had set apart a day on which some sixty addresses were presented to him from all parts of the Presidency, to all of which he gave suitable replies. When his successor, the Marquis of Dufferin, paid a visit here there was some popular demonstration. He received the addresses of all public bodies on the place of landing and gave replies. On the occasion of the arrival of the Marquis of Lansdowne there was no enthusiasm whatever. That nobleman also set apart a day to receive all the addresses at the Government House. There was no censorship exercised over any one of those addresses. But now, during the time of His Excellency, Lord Elgin, the Home Rule Viceroy, things have taken a new turn. His Excellency desired that copies of all addresses should be sent so as to reach him on October 16th. Mark the time. He was to arrive in Madras in December. Several public bodies sent copies of their addresses. Some were declined *in toto* on the ground that the Viceroy had no time, and one important political body was asked to omit three paragraphs from its address. The Mahajana Sabha of Madras passed a resolution that under the circumstances no address should be presented. The Viceroy's refusal to receive an unmutilated address from

the Madras Mahajana Sabha created a profound sensation all over the country. The Indian press, both English and vernacular, condemned Lord Elgin's action and congratulated the Sabha on its attitude. The presentation of an address to the Sovereign is a recognised custom, and Lord Elgin has incurred a serious responsibility in denying a privilege which all British subjects enjoy and prize. It is sincerely hoped that the British public will open its eyes to the grave injustice done to Her Majesty's Indian subjects by her accredited representative. The Madras papers—both Indian and Anglo-Indian—with one voice condemned the action of the Viceroy. The *Madras Mail*, the organ of the Anglo-Indians characterised the act as short-sighted, and remarked that Lord Elgin was quite mistaken in requesting that some paragraphs should be expunged. The *Madras Times*, another Anglo-Indian paper observed that,

"so far as the large body of Hindus are concerned, Lord Elgin will be more unpopular among them after his visit than before, wholly owing to his Lordship's want of condescension and tact. This is the first time in Madras in which a Viceroy has behaved in this indiscreet manner."

The *Hindu* described the whole business as meaningless, and said that

"the Viceroy will not receive the address unless certain portions or topics are eliminated; and it is for the public bodies so treated to decide whether, under such circumstances, they should present any address to him at all. His Excellency may impose conditions, but we have the privilege of declining those conditions and withdrawing our addresses. We are sorry we have to write in this manner about the representative of the Queen; but the unexpected attitude of Lord Elgin has rendered a little bit of plain speaking necessary."

The *Madras Standard*, after condemning the Viceroy for his short-sighted and unstatesmanlike conduct, observed that the three paragraphs to which

"objection has been taken contain in fact the very pith of the address, and it is certainly absurd to expect the Sabha to present an address which has no aim or object in view. The Sabha has done well, and deserves well of the country. Madras has again set an example which other Presidencies might copy with advantage."

So much for Madras public opinion. The opinion of all the Indian press was unanimous and vehement. The question is an important one, and the Home Rule Viceroy has in a measure trifled with the feelings of the country. The attitude of the Viceroy is in perfect harmony with the present temper of a considerable section of the bureaucracy, and the British public may be left to judge whether Lord Elgin, being a responsible representative of the sovereign, was justified. It is noteworthy that during his stay in Madras he never spoke to any Indian for more than five minutes. His cold demeanour was the subject of general talk among all classes of Indians.

THE DUTY OF EDUCATED INDIA.

ELOQUENT SPEECH BY MR. P. M. MEHTA.

We refer elsewhere to the eloquent speech delivered by the Hon. Pherozeshah M. Mehta, C.I.E., at the Gaiety Theatre, Bombay, on December 20th, in reply to two addresses which were presented to him by the citizens of Bombay and the delegates of the Eighth Bombay Provincial Conference. We reproduce below some of the most important passages in Mr. Mehta's impressive address, which a Bombay correspondent aptly describes as "in reality a kind of manifesto, as well as a vigorous vindication, of educated Indians." Mr. Mehta said that he regarded the addresses as having been presented to him not so much in his personal capacity, but

"as setting forth the motives which actuate the conduct of educated men throughout the country, the principles which guide and regulate their action, the credentials which they possess of their qualifications, and the constituents whom they can, if not scientifically and systematically, at any rate, really and substantially, represent. From this point of view, gentlemen, I receive your addresses with the most grateful acceptance, as setting the seal of public approbation and appreciation on motives which it is now the fashion to malign, on principles which are ignored or misrepresented through prejudice and intolerance, on credentials which are denied, and on the actuality of constituents who are said to have no existence."

"A RECRUDESCENCE OF CALUMNY."

The time chosen for this vindication was, Mr. Mehta said, most appropriate, as there had been recently "a remarkable recrudescence of calumny, misrepresentation and resentment against all those natives who venture, however humbly to take an active interest in the welfare and progress of their country."

"We are bound at all times to speak with respect of the high functionaries of the Crown. We can only deplore that so responsible a Minister as the present Conservative Secretary of State for India, Lord George Hamilton, should have been so far misled as to speak of us in a letter recently written by him as 'those who wish to destroy and revolutionize the organic institutions of their country.' (Oh! oh!) As if this was not enough, we have been only the other day reviled as croakers of evil, shouters of sedition, and revolution-mongers—(loud laughter)—by one of our own countrymen—(loud laughter)—who though never a prophet in his own country, is, by some occult process of metamorphosis, made to look like and pose in England as if he were really a great man in Israel—(renewed laughter)—a man who hob-nobbed with our Rájas, and Máhárájas, was hand and glove with our merchant princes, was foremost among the kings of industrial development, was a philanthropic employer of labour, and who was at the same time the sympathetic friend and patron of the Zemindar and the rayat. (Laughter.) We have never recognized but one Indian who had the right to make a representative claim for all India—and that man by universal acclaim is Dadabhai Naoroji—(loud cheers)—to whom prince and peasant joined to give more than a royal welcome on his way to Lahore, the Christmas before last. The pretensions of Mr. Bhownaggree to depose Mr. Dadabhai in the hearts of his countrymen of all classes and degrees could only be received in India, as they actually were received, with amused shouts and roars of laughter."

THE TWO MR. BHOWNAGGREES.

Mr. Bhownaggree, continued Mr. Mehta, had denounced the educated classes "as sowing discontent and sedition by their perpetual selfish and unscrupulous attacks upon the English in India." This statement was received with "renewed laughter," and Mr. Mehta proceeded:—

"Gentlemen, I for one recognize the singular competence of Mr. Bhownaggree to formulate such an indictment, for I have a very vivid recollection of an incident that took place some years ago. I was returning from Kathiawar and a friend joined me at Wadhwan. We got out for dinner at the refreshment room at Ahmedabad Station. On returning to our compartment, we found an English gentleman installed in it with a huge and fierce-looking dog by his side. Both my friend and myself had very strong objections to travelling in such company for a whole night, and we tried to persuade him to relegate his companion to the dog-box in accordance with

railway regulations. On his refusal, I spoke to the station-master, which so irritated the dog's owner that very soon my friend and he came to high words and some not very choice language, and I had just time to rush between them to prevent them from proceeding to blows. (Laughter.) As I took my friend aside and tried to pacify him, the English gentlemen complained to people gathered about how utterly unreasonable and provoking our conduct was in objecting to the company of his dog. 'I never object to travelling even with natives in the same compartment,' he said with the most aggrieved air in the world. You can scarcely conceive, gentlemen, the paroxysm of fury into which my excited friend was thrown at this comparison of the status of dogs and natives, none the less stinging because made with the most perfect unconsciousness of its insolence. I thought it advisable to take him and myself to another compartment where I tried to moderate his somewhat violent tirades against the intolerable rudeness of Europeans towards natives of all classes from princes downwards, by telling him not to generalize overmuch or take individual cases too seriously. But he was not to be consoled; he scouted all attempts to explain away the insolence of the treatment of natives by Europeans as anything akin to the estrangement caused by the exclusive character of native social and religious ways. He called to mind many of the stories on this point related in that excellent article in the October number of the *Contemporary Review* from the pen of the Rev. Mr Bonnar. . . . . . Though feeling very sleepy, I was regaled by my friend for half the night with croaking fears as to the permanence of British rule owing to this galling behaviour towards natives, of the same character as are now denounced in the mouth of educated natives. This friend of mine, the hero of this story, was, gentlemen, no other than Mr. Bhownaggree—(loud laughter and cheers)—who has now recanted the errors of his old ways and is posing as a reformed character before Anglo-Indian audiences to denounce the folly and danger of allowing the educated classes to make perpetual attacks on, and criticise Europeans in India, who, if they have faults, have them only as the sun has spots." (Laughter).

Higher Education in India.

"Our faults," Mr. Mehta added, "are many, our imperfections numerous, our capacities and abilities neither great nor brilliant, our methods disjointed and spasmodic, but our motives are not what they are represented to be by a certain class of Anglo-Indians who have now caught Mr. Bhownaggree to echo their sentiments." Passing on, Mr. Mehta spoke in enthusiastic terms of the spread of higher education:

"From the educational institutions established under the glowing inspiration of so noble a genius as that of Mountstuart Elphinstone issued a band of noble youths thoroughly imbued with the sentiment that the education which they had received was given to them, not only to promote their own worldly advancement, but to devote it at the same time in grateful performance of what that education taught them was the sacred duty of helping, in however humble a way, in making the foreign rule of the country in whose hands the destinies of their mother country had been placed by the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, a blessing to them both instead of a curse. (Cheers.) . . . . There is no word which is so misused and maltreated, and which is more made the vehicle of the fallacy of the middle term than conservatism, when it is used to preach inactivity on our part. (Applause.) Because India is conservative, is there no need on our part to agitate for the reduction, for example, of the salt tax in the interest of the masses, for the enforcement of a policy of economy, for the lightening of the burdens on the land, for securing a more sympathetic and less insolent treatment of natives by Europeans, for securing juster verdicts from European juries in cases of offences against natives? (Cheers.) It is grossly misleading to suppose that what we aim at is to supersede Englishmen altogether, or, as it is sometimes put, to take the administration of the country into our own hands, leaving them the solitary task of supporting us with English bayonets. (Cheers.) On the contrary, no one is more ready than ourselves to acknowledge the singular capacity of the British nation over all other civilised peoples on the surface of the earth for governing a continent like that of India." (Applause.)

English "Aloofness."

It was in providing against the perils of a foreign rule of so complex a character that "the watchful criticism and close co-operation of the educated classes could not but be most useful and helpful." The danger, not of an open reversal, but of insidious and indirect evasion of the policy inaugurated in 1858 was always imminent.

"The danger and the mischief lie, in the first place, in the one-sidedness and secrecy of the system, and, secondly, in the circumstance that English officialdom is not in touch with the people. (Loud applause.) I know that the latter statement of fact is vehemently and passionately denied, so passionately indeed that one is tempted to suspect that my lady protests too much. . . . . It has often been a matter of great surprise to me, as I believe it has been to many others, to find in unexpected casual ways how even the most experienced and sympathetic European officers incidentally betray the most startling inability to enter into and comprehend the simplest facts of native life and native thought. The reason lies in what may be termed the 'aloofness' of the English character and temperament. The district officer does his work, but outside and beyond that he stands utterly aloof from the people. His interests and his amusements are jealously confined within the narrow circle of his own people, and he never seeks an opportunity, as he has not the inclination, to enter really into the life of the people around him in the hundred ways in which it can be done even between people of different social and religious creeds."

Ignorance of the Vernaculars.

Moreover Anglo-Indians have another serious disqualification. They are not familiar with the Indian vernaculars:—

"Englishmen are not easy linguists at any time; but in India they never acquire anything distantly approaching to a living knowledge of any of the different languages of the people. In the Bombay Presidency there are not half-a-dozen men who have a good colloquial knowledge of any of the vernaculars, or can carry on a decent conversation on general subjects with an ordinary native. They never acquire the lights and shades which are the current coin of the intercommunion of native life, and without a knowledge of which it is impossible to dive into the heart and mind of the people. In pointing out the hollowness of the assertion that District Officers are in touch with the people, I am not enunciating a grievance or exposing a fault; it may be that the aloofness which causes it has its own uses and advantages in other directions; I am simply stating a fact. But it is a fact which is of great importance to recognise. It places these officers in the hands of the people around them who may or may not be worthy of confidence in the way of knowledge, capacity or interest, and deprives their views, opinions and conclusions of the authority due to information at first hand. But unfortunate as this circumstance is in itself, it is fraught with immeasurable possibilities of injustice, oppression, and mischief when taken in connection with the secrecy with which the administration is chiefly carried on." (Cheers.)

Criticism and "Prestige."

"Criticism," Mr. Mehta continued, "is the only antidote of any real efficacy which we possess at present against the inevitable evils of a secret and irresponsible bureaucracy." Those who advocated the repression of criticism urged that complaints lowered the "prestige" of officials.

"Gentlemen, I have come to dread nothing so much as the intrusion of this wonderful word 'prestige' in Indian political discussion. It does duty for every act and measure that has no other argument to support it. Only the other day, so eminent a politician as the present leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Arthur Balfour, vindicated the retention of Chitral on the imperious score of 'prestige,' forgetting that even the carefully edited Chitral Blue-book showed that the occupation was part of a deliberate scheme designed so far back as 1886. (Cries of 'shame.') To me it seems that the

'prestige' both of the administration and its officers, instead of suffering, is likely to be increased under a freer system, because, in the first place the work would be more carefully and impartially done, just as judicial work is done more cautiously and carefully under a system of appeal, and secondly, because there would be a diminution of the possibilities of undeserved obloquy and dissatisfaction arising from ignorance and misunderstanding which a little publicity and explanation would easily remove. (Cheers.)"

Educated Indians: Typical Credentials.

But it is sometimes said that educated Indians are even less in touch with the people than District Officers are. Indians are said to be so denationalized by education as to no longer understand native life and sentiments. To this precious theory Mr. Mehta replied as follows:—

"What are the facts? Why, the large majority of educated natives are drawn from the small towns and villages of the Presidency, and have grown up in contact with all varieties of the trading and agricultural classes. Then is the educated native estranged by his education from his kith and kin, and utterly denationalized? So far from that being the case, we have had recently to deplore a very suggestive spectacle of educated natives sympathizing and going hand in hand in an extreme spirit of reaction and intolerance with the old orthodox opponents of all social reform. It is monstrous to allege that, however educated, the native can throw off the material from which he has grown and developed. A native, educated or not, must in the nature of things intuitively understand native thought and feeling, where the most cultured European must lamentably fail. It is not a question of capacity or attainments, but in the one case it is a question of arduous effort; in the other, it is simple nature. . . . . But what are our credentials of positive knowledge? The other day a friend of mine told me that he was travelling with a high English officer—a Superintendent of Police—and the conversation turning upon the debate on the Police Bill in the Viceroy's Council, the officer was very severe upon my presumption in opposing it, as I could know nothing of things in the Mofussil—(laughter)—whatever may be the extent of my ignorance regarding the city of Bombay. (Loud laughter.) This, gentlemen, is a typical charge in which Anglo-Indian officials are fond of indulging. Though by no means a very favourable specimen, I am willing to submit to an examination on that point—(laughter and cheers)—not of ability, but of knowledge and experience of the people. During a practice of a quarter of a century, I have gone on professional business, times without number. I have traversed in this way Guzarat and Kathiawar, Rajputana and Central India, the Districts to the East and a great portion of the Deccan and Southern Mahratta country. I have thus visited not only the large and small towns, but thanks to the combination of revenue and judicial functions—(laughter)—I have followed the camps of District Officers from village to village in the remotest parts of the Presidency. I have had to appear before all classes of officers from the Mahalakari and Mamlatdar to the District Magistrate and the District Judge. I have practiced in the Courts of Native States and have pleaded before Native Chiefs and their judicial officers of every degree of competence. In the course of these peregrinations, I have come in free, close, and spontaneous communion with all classes of clients, from the Thakore and Talukdar, the tradesman and the artisan, the zemindar and the rayat, not to forget the most famous outlaw of Kathiawar of present days, don't be alarmed, gentlemen, not in the way of being looted—(a laugh)—but in friendly converse and consultation. But it is not the extent of this communion only, that is of importance, it is the nature and character of it. In Guzarat, Kathiawar, and Rajputana at least, I was a native speaking in a common vernacular; in the Mahratta country, I could understand, though I could not freely speak in the language of those parts. I confess my ignorance of Canarese. This alone gave me an immeasurable advantage over the best of Europeans. But what was still greater, the hearts of the people would open to me as they could never open to any, even the most sympathetic, officer, and I could enter into their real thoughts and feelings and interests without let or difficulty. These are my credentials, and they are typical of those of hundreds of educated and intelligent natives. I think we can therefore lay claim to know a trifle more of the heart and mind of our countrymen than the ablest and most experienced of English officers. Some of them have deservedly earned a high reputation for industry and capacity in compiling statistical catalogues and encyclopædias of every variety of Indian information; they perhaps possess a larger collection of the dry bones of Indian history. But of the living forces of Indian life and sentiment, we must humbly take the liberty of claiming a more intuitive, intimate, and superior knowledge. (Applause.)"

Their Constituents.

Coming to the question, Who are the constituents of educated Indians? Mr. Mehta said that, without being elected, their communion and common nature with the people qualified them to understand and to interpret their wants in a more representative way than their foreign rulers.

"A Kathiawar chief was once put up to say in England that native chiefs had no sympathy with bodies like the Congress and the ways of our educated classes. (Laughter.) Nothing could be more inaccurate. Speaking from my own knowledge, I can vouch that the majority of the chiefs of this Presidency have close sympathy with the aims and objects of educated natives—(applause)—and specially with those of the Congress—(loud applause)—and they have given substantial proofs of their friendly interest. It is true that they do not always give open expression to their views, for fear of displeasing their political officers, who have it in their power to harass them in a hundred different ways, or to withhold from them the guns, orders and honours which they dearly love. But we can know and interpret their opinions and sentiments better than political officers. We know that they are true and loyal, but we know how they resent the treatment that is often given them, for example, in the close and secret manner of deciding upon their claims and rights and differences. . . . . We can equally represent the great masses of the people, and we can enunciate their grievances and the measures for redressing them. We can ask for a reduction of the salt tax in their interest; we can ask for a lighter assessment of the land; we can ask for them economy and reduction of expenditure, and we can point out that nothing is more responsible for squandering the revenues of the country than the military policy which has again come into favour since 1884-1885. We can point out that, while one north-west scientific frontier was bad enough, that policy has added another promising to be equally troublesome, if not in time worse, on the north-east, in the conquest and acquisition of Upper Burma. . . . . It is no doubt a proud prospect for vainglorious 'great Englanders,' but the country regretfully casts wistful glances on the wise policy of Lord Lawrence, whose keen sagacity had recognised that by costly efforts and enterprises to strengthen the outposts and frontiers, you may be indirectly weakening the base by impoverishing the people and undermining their contentment."

"A High and Noble Mission."

"In these and a hundred different ways we are," said Mr. Mehta in conclusion, "qualified by our position, our circumstances and our education to speak for, to represent and to serve our countrymen of all grades and classes. It is a high and noble mission, imposed by duty and sanctified by patriotism. Let us hope and trust that we may be enabled to rise higher and higher to it, to guide it with unswerving loyalty, to temper it with discretion and moderation, to prosecute it with constancy and integrity, and cement it with harmony and union. Individual persons can participate in it in only a small and humble way, but your presence here shows that if we honestly and fearlessly endeavour to perform what little it may be given to each of us to do, we may be sure of the unstinted and generous support and appreciation of our countrymen of all classes, creeds and persuasions." (Loud and long continued applause.)

NOTICES.

TO CONTRIBUTORS.

The Editor of India cannot hold himself responsible in any case for the return of MS. He will, however, always be glad to consider any contributions which may be submitted to him; and when postage stamps are enclosed every effort will be made to return rejected contributions promptly.—Address: Editor of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

The annual subscription to India (post free) is six shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or to any other matter of business connected with India, should in all cases be sent to the Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.

Cheques and Post-office orders should be made payable to Mr. W. Douglas Hall.

Copies of India can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from Mr. Elliott Stock, Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; from Messrs. Deighton, Bell and Co., Trinity Street, Cambridge; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.

TO ADVERTISERS.

India presents unique advantages as an advertising medium. All communications as to advertisements should be sent to the Advertisement Manager of India, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W., who will, on application, forward lists of charges.

INDIA.

LONDON, FEBRUARY, 1896.

THE CONGRESS AT POONA.

The Eleventh Indian National Congress, which met at Poona during the closing days of December last, was, as our Special Correspondent informs us, and as may be gathered from the universal testimony of the Indian press, a brilliant success. Those who feared, and those others who hoped, that it might prove a scene of faction and division, feared and hoped in vain. It would seem, indeed, that the differences of opinion which were brought to light during the preparations for the Congress have, from one point of view, proved a blessing in disguise. They served to kindle enthusiasm and to arouse curiosity. It is impossible within our limits of space to attempt anything like a full report of the speeches delivered at Poona. We print, however, the text of the resolutions which were adopted, and we endeavour, in the two following articles and elsewhere, to present to our readers in succinct form the salient features alike of the National Congress and of the Social Conference. These are supplemented by the brilliant and suggestive speech delivered by Mr. Pherozeshah M. Mehta at Bombay, of which we reproduce the greater part, and which Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., discusses on another page. Lord Lansdowne, speaking at a University Extension meeting in London on January 24th, said that the extension of municipal government in India, and the admission of Indians to the legislative councils, far from embarrassing British authority, had been "the means of giving a useful outlet to public "opinion in the country" and had "in many ways "assisted those who are responsible for the conduct "of the affairs of India." The Indian National Congress, which Lord Lansdowne apparently forgot to mention, fulfils the same useful purpose on a vastly greater scale. Its opinions, formulated by the educated community, expressed by representative Indians of ability and experience, and embodied in its resolutions, deserve the careful attention not only of students of that most fascinating of all movements, the course of events, but also of Parliament, the constituencies of the United Kingdom, and the Government of India. The position of Lord Melbourne's Ministry in the House of Lords was compared to the position of a water-logged wreck into which enemies from all quarters poured their broadsides. Lord Salisbury's Ministry is strong in the House of Lords, but it is harassed by a tangled skein of foreign difficulties, and it cannot lightly ignore the essentially sane and moderate requests of the millions of loyal British subjects in India.

One of the first and most important resolutions of the Poona Congress expressed the opinion that the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure will be useless unless it enquires into the lines of policy which regulate expenditure. Before the administration of British India was transferred from the East India Company to the Crown, there was a periodical stock-taking every twenty years at each renewal of the Company's Charter. These periods of investigation coincide with the concession of some of the greatest boons which the people of India have obtained. Since 1858 there has been no such enquiry, and, as we have so often shown, the present Royal Commission is not by any means the kind of Commission which was wanted and asked for. It is, in the emphatic words of Mr. Baikuntha Nath Sen, who proposed the resolution in question, "neither "the semblance nor the shadow of what they "wanted." He referred in terms of the deepest gratitude, and amid the cheers of his vast audience, to the services of the British Committee and the Indian Parliamentary Committee in obtaining the appointment of the Commission. But what the spokesmen of those bodies asked for was enquiry into the condition of the people of India, their capacity or incapacity to bear their present financial burdens, the possibility of reducing expenditure, the nature of the revenue system, and the financial relations between India and the United Kingdom. Lord Welby's Commission, thanks to Sir Henry Fowler, is much less ambitious, and it deliberates with closed doors, as if, in the words of one speaker, it were hearing some specially unsavoury divorce suit. Still, that is no reason why it should not be used for all that it is worth, and it will be strange indeed if the strenuous labours of Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, and Mr. W. S. Caine produce no good result. The Congress, as was to be expected, laid special emphasis upon the need of taking evidence in India as well as in London, a suggestion which ought not to escape the notice of Lord Welby and his colleagues. It is hard to see how, in spite of Sir Henry Fowler, the Commission can avoid investigation of policy. The Congress, at any rate

MADRAS, 100, MOUNT ROAD,
20th January, 1896.

All letters and remittances are to be sent to Mr. C. S. Rajagopala Chariar, Agent "India," Palatope, Mylapore, Madras.

DEAR SIR,

By to-day's post I send a copy of "INDIA" for January 1896, and request you to subscribe for the same if you are not a subscriber to it already, as the annual subscription is only Rupees Six.

"INDIA."

Is a monthly Journal published in the interests of the people of this country in London and contains an elaborate report of all debates in the Parliament on Indian questions. When bound at the end of the year in one Volume it will form a valuable addition to our library.

Yours truly,
M. VIRARAGHAVA CHARY,
Honorary Secretary,
Standing Congress Committee.

☞ If you are not a subscriber already, please do become one without fail.

MADRAS :—PRINTED AT THE NATIONAL PRESS.

has consistently maintained that the chief cause of India's financial embarrassments is not the fall in exchange, but the growth of military expenditure. It sees the only remedy in "a material curtailment "of the expenditure on the Army Services and other "military expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost "of civil administration." Mr. D. E. Wacha, who proposed this resolution, rightly complained that adequate details of expenditure are not furnished by the Government of India. We need not, at this moment, dwell upon a subject with which our readers are so familiar. But we record with great satisfaction the appointment of so indefatigable a worker as Mr. Wacha to be joint honorary Secretary of the Congress in India. Side by side with his resolution we may place another, moved by Mr. H. A. Wadia, of Bombay, declaring that the expenses of expeditions which aim at extending the frontiers of British India should be shared between the United Kingdom and India, and that without some such guarantee the "forward" military policy will involve India in hopeless financial confusion. The point is, of course, that if British taxpayers bore a part of the expense, these expeditions would disappear. In this connexion we may mention Dr. Bahadurji's grave allegations as to the reckless waste of stores in India—a possible cause of expenditure to which Lord Welby's Commission may well pay attention. The result of extravagant expenditure is seen in the odious severity of the salt tax and the neglect of education. One of the resolutions of the Congress thanked Lord George Hamilton for his promise, made last September, to take an early opportunity of reducing the salt tax. The mover, who cited some appalling statistics as to the consumption of salt, expressed a fear that, in view of Lord G. Hamilton's promises to Lancashire, the thanks of the Congress might be premature. The fear was well grounded. Sir James Westland has since proposed to employ fifty lakhs, not in reducing the salt tax, but in readjusting the cotton duties. Can we wonder if Indians reflect bitterly that "on the one side you have the Man- "chester manufacturers, whose voice is powerful, "and who make and unmake Cabinets; while on "the other side you have the Indian peasant, "always quietly bearing the burdens that God and "man may choose to impose upon him"?

But the financial question, grave as it is, is not the whole of the Indian problem. Lord Lansdowne, in the recent speech which we have already quoted, said that if he wished to show what Englishmen were capable of accomplishing, he would point to India. It is probable that he was not thinking at the moment of the threatened interference with trial by jury and the continued combination of executive and judicial functions in the same officers. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance and the value of the speeches delivered upon these subjects by two such competent authorities as Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee and Mr. Manomohan Ghose. Mr. Bonnerjee, speaking with the authority of the leader of the Calcutta Bar, expressed the alarm which is felt at the changes that are continually being made and threatened in respect of trial by jury in India. His speech was a luminous survey of the history of the subject down to the recent Jury Bill which, according to Lord Elgin, proposed a system of special verdicts merely for the sake of obtaining an academic discussion of the question. We should like to know—perhaps we do know—what would be thought of a Government which, in the interests of a debating society, made a similar proposal in this country. Trial by jury is regarded as an institution of vital importance in England. It is still more essential in India where district officers, whose knowledge of the vernaculars is such as to satisfy an examiner, need the co-operation of jurors who do not need to translate the evidence of witnesses. Mr. Bonnerjee was able to state that, so far as Bengal was concerned, not a single complaint against trial by jury had been sent up by any section of the population, and nobody had even alleged that a jury had acquitted a criminal who ought to have been convicted. As for the egregious system of special verdicts, which would enable and encourage a judge to cross-examine jurors, Mr. Bonnerjee cannot find in English history, from first to last, even a solitary instance of special verdicts in a criminal case. Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who in an admirable speech renewed the appeal for the separation of judicial and executive functions, repeated the conclusive evidence which he lately adduced in our columns and at a meeting of the East India Association. We need not re-open here a subject of which eminent authorities treat on another page, except to cite the statement, mentioned by Mr. Ghose, of a high Bengal official. That disinterested critic is reported to have assured the Government of India that it was undesirable to divest the district magistrate of his judicial powers because he was the "connecting "link" between the police and the judiciary of his district. "Connecting link," indeed! *Hoc prætexit nomine culpam.* The whole subject is, we are glad to say, shortly to be brought before Parliament and the Secretary of State for India, and we trust that some practical steps may be taken, without much further delay, to remove what is undoubtedly a crying scandal. We have not left ourselves space to discuss the rest of the resolutions. But they are not new. Indian reform moves slowly, and the demands which independent opinion in India puts forward from year to year have not the elementary merit of novelty. They are, nevertheless, of supreme importance, and to ignore them, in a spirit either of contempt or of indifference, is the part not merely of fools but of madmen.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji, in the opening words of the eloquent, luminous and comprehensive address which he delivered as President of the Eleventh Indian National Congress, described that assembly as the non-official Parliament of the Indian nation. It is nothing less. Whatever may be the differences of race and creed in India, all races and all creeds meet at the Congress upon a common platform, to protect and extend their rights and to redress their grievances. The preparations for the Poona Congress brought to light, indeed, certain differences

within the Congress camp upon the subject of Social Reform. Mr. Banerji, who referred to these incidents in statesmanlike terms, pointed out that those Indians who are, and those who are not, cordial supporters of the Social Conference are nevertheless animated by a common sentiment of devotion to the National Congress. The Congress has not, as yet, a written constitution. Its proceedings and its composition are determined not by law but by custom. Proposals have, however, been made again and again during the past ten years to give to this organisation, which is fighting a constitutional battle, something like a constitutional basis. Mr. Banerji warmly advocated the adoption of well defined rules, which should embody existing practice and obviate future difficulties. The Congress has now passed beyond the stage of infancy. It has survived persecution and abuse, and what it has now to avoid is rather the internal danger of dissension and dispute. Nobody who surveys the triumphant career of the Congress will for a moment believe that that danger is serious. Lord Macaulay, in a prophetic moment, looked forward to a time when British Indian subjects, being instructed in European knowledge, might crave for European institutions. If such a day came, it would be, he said, the proudest in the annals of England. The day has come, and the Congress is the representative exponent of the wishes and hopes of the Indian people. Mr. Banerji, who dwelt with enthusiasm upon the brilliant record of the Congress, claimed for it that it had not taken up a single question without bringing it into the field of practical politics. But it is not merely that in such questions as the enlargement of the Councils, the separation of judicial and executive functions, the reform of the Police and the more generous admission of Indians to the higher offices of State, the Congress has put forward with vigorous moderation the demands of the educated community. It has produced a new spirit, developed a new enthusiasm, and in no mean degree united together the scattered elements of a vast and diversified population.

The Indian Councils Act of 1892 was due to the continued agitation of the Congress, but it fell far short of the hopes of the Congress. Mr. Banerji says that the people of India regard it not as a final settlement but only as a cautious experiment. Mr. Gladstone, discussing the provisions of the measure, said that he hoped it might lead to a living representation of the Indian people. Lord Salisbury said much the same. Would either of them maintain that in Bengal, for example, seven elected members can represent adequately the living strength of a community of seventy millions? The stock argument against the enlargement of the Councils is that the Government must have a standing majority, and therefore if the number of elected members is increased, the number of nominated members must be increased also. The answer is that this increase in the number of official members is not necessary to secure a majority. Mr. Banerji cited the case of the Calcutta Municipality where, although the elected members constitute two-thirds of the whole body, the chairman never failed to carry any resolution which he strongly desired to carry. If the number of elected members of the Councils were increased, the Government would share in the benefit. Even Sir Charles Elliott has expressed the opinion that the extension of the Bengal Legislative Council materially added to its strength, its popularity, and its usefulness. The right of interpellation, in spite of a reluctance in some quarters to give satisfactory answers, has proved specially valuable not only in obtaining information for the public but also in removing misapprehensions as to the policy of the Government. The practice might well be so extended as to include supplementary questions, such as we find in the House of Commons, and brief explanatory speeches, such as we find in the House of Lords. Under the Act of 1892 discussion of the Indian Budget was allowed. But no resolution may be moved, or division taken, upon any item. Mr. Banerji maintains, and maintains rightly, that if there is one class of questions more than another in which popular representatives should exercise control, it is in financial questions. The authority and usefulness of the Councils are further threatened by the new doctrine of "mandate" which declares that members must vote, not according to their opinions, but according to rule. It is one thing for members of Parliament to follow the mandates of constituents with whom they agree. It is another thing for members of a legislative council to obey the dictates of a Secretary of State from whom they differ. Burke, who was a Conservative, though he called himself a Whig, refused in vehement terms to accept instructions even from constituents. Lord Elgin, who is a Whig, though he calls himself a Liberal, is willing to accept and to defend mandates from the India Office. Mr. Banerji discussed at considerable length the financial condition of India. If it be true, as John Bright held, that the financial condition of a country is a sure sign of the character of its Government, the Government of India must be incompetent indeed. Ever recurring deficit, ever increasing debt, are the terms in which Mr. Banerji sums up Indian finance, and, with Sir Auckland Colvin, Sir David Barbour, the Bombay Presidency Asssociation, and the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, he finds the chief cause of financial embarrassment in the policy of military aggression. The recent expedition to Chitral was condemned with remarkable unanimity by Indian public opinion. "Prestige" compelled Lord Salisbury's Government to occupy the country in spite of the Viceroy's proclamation. Mr. Balfour says that the retention of Chitral will involve no addition to the Indian army. But Lord Salisbury recently warned us that politicians are apt to under-estimate the cost of projects which they desire to fulfil. If the Indian army is able, without any additional strength or expenditure, to retain Chitral, it is obvious that its previous strength and expenditure were in excess of what was wanted.

We trust that members of Parliament will read with attention Mr. Banerji's vigorous condemnation of the costly, futile and dangerous "forward" policy. The true scientific frontier against Russian invasion lies, he said, not in a remote and inaccessible mountain, nor in the House of Commons, but in the grateful hearts of a loyal and contented people.

The "forward" policy, as Lord Lawrence foresaw, squanders the resources of India to no purpose, while urgent domestic reforms are postponed through lack of funds. It is to be hoped that the whole question, together with the question of the Home Charges, will be thoroughly sifted by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure. When Sir C. Dilke was invited on a certain occasion to state his views on an Indian question, he replied that he had stated them twenty years before, and the question stood where it did. It is not easy to lend novelty to the subjects which the Indian National Congress places in the forefront of its programme, but Mr. Banerji treated each in turn with force and spirit. As for the Indian cotton duties, he said plainly that if Manchester has a grievance, she should agitate for financial justice to India, and she would command the sympathies of educated India. Financial justice is not to be found in the Home Charges, in Exchange Compensation Allowance, or in artificial restrictions on Indian industries. Mr. Banerji expects—and we trust that he may not be disappointed —great results from the labours of Lord Welby's Commission, although, in common with all disinterested observers, he regrets that it carries on its deliberations with closed doors. Every Association in India ought, he said, to send representations to the Commission bearing on the question of Indian expenditure and the adjustment of charges between India and the United Kingdom. He repeated with admirable cogency the case for simultaneous examinations, accentuated as it was by the glaring disparity between the best and the worst of the successful candidates at the last examination. The concession of the right so patiently and so eloquently advocated by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji is as necessary to the efficiency of the public service as it is to the continued loyalty of British Indians. The exclusion of Indians from the commissioned ranks in the army is a piece of gratuitous injustice which contrasts unpleasantly with the policy of Akbar. In dealing with the deplorable combination of judicial and executive functions in the same officers, Mr. Banerji made a practical suggestion which we heartily endorse. He proposed that an official document should be published annually in each province by some recognised Association, recording the cases which illustrated the evils of the present system and the need of separation. Mr. Banerji's remarks on the Jury Bill and the neglect of education in India deserve careful attention, and it is interesting to find the President of the Congress declaring that Indian questions cannot engage much attention in England until they become party questions. Taken as a whole the speech is a remarkable and compendious statement of contemporary opinion among educated Indians. It should be carefully read by Englishmen who wish to obtain an insight into Indian questions from the non-official standpoint. At the close of a brilliant and exhaustive address Mr. Banerji reminded his hearers that the moral sympathies of civilised humanity were with them, and exhorted them to possess their souls in patience, supported by the undying faith that their cause, based upon the highest justice, must ultimately triumph.

THE SOCIAL CONFERENCE.

The rift in the lute at Poona has, of course, been exaggerated for the purposes of malevolent hostility either to the Social Conference or to the Congress or else to both. This was quite an inevitable result of the divisive forces at work. It is true that the Conference, which has just held its ninth meeting, assembled for the first time in a separate *mandap* from the Congress; and on the face of this fact there is testimony to an unhappy perversity or one-sidedness of view on the one part or on the other or on both. It seems incredibly thoughtless to suppose that movements of the magnitude and complexity of the Conference and the Congress, movements that touch so many and so sensitive roots of social sentiment over so vast an area, can possibly go forward without frequent and considerable friction. The reasonable anticipation is directly the contrary. Men will think differently, for fifty reasons beyond human control. Men will act at different rates of promptitude, and go off at unexpected tangents. Men will persist in believing that just their own particular view is right, and that every other possible view is wrong. The full flower of reason does not bloom in the actions of a nation or a party all in a flash. Let us be reasonable in our expectations of Indian reforms. And let us look at the facts dispassionately.

What is the extent of the rift? It is not true to say that the Congress refused to allow the Conference the accustomed use of its *pandal*. At an early stage in the preparations for the Congress a section of the Poona Committee took up a position, though at that time without the support of any of the other Congress Committees, in view of which the leaders of the Social Conference decided not to ask for the customary favour of the loan of the pavilion. These facts, exaggerated as they have been by men who care neither for the Congress nor for the Conference except in so far as the one may be employed to injure the other, do not justify the conclusion that the Congress had bidden the Conference go its way in separation. Of course, the two movements are perfectly distinct in their organisation and in their immediate and particular objects; and the fact that the Congress originally included in its programme one section of the subjects that are now cared for by the Conference shows nothing more than that the division was practically expedient for the better progress of the general cause. The holding of the annual meetings of the two bodies in the same town and in the same building was simply a matter of general convenience, most of the visitors sympathising with both lines of reform work. The ill-judged energy of the particularists has made the rift more distinct for the moment by leading the Conference to refrain from asking the use of the Congress *pandal* as on former occasions. Now how far does this concession to them represent the views of the adherents of the Congress? A circular letter was addressed to each of the standing committees of the Congress, asking their opinion as to the loan of the Congress *pandal* to the Conference, and the following is a summary of their replies:

"There are 28 replies favourable to the Conference *plus* 4

which are indifferent or advise reference to the Congress: in all 32. There are besides 17 unfavourable, but of that number 10 are in full sympathy with Conference work, but advise concession this year to the Poona opposition, and there are only 7 replies which seem to be opposed. The proportion of favourable to unfavourable is thus nearly 2 to 1; and, including those who advise concession for this year only, the proportion is as 6 to 1. In the order of provinces, the Bombay replies are 13; of these 9 are favourable, 2 sympathetic, and 2 opposed. Taking the last two together, the proportion is more than 2 to 1. The Madras replies are 9, out of which 8 are favourable and 1 indifferent. Thus it may be seen that the whole of Madras with one single exception is favourable—and that too is indifferent, and leaves the whole thing to the Poona Committee. In the North-Western Provinces and Oudh, out of 7 replies received, 6 are favourable, and only 1 is opposed. The proportion of favourable to opposed is, therefore, 6 to 1. In the Punjab, the favourable opinions, which are 3, outweigh 2 unfavourable opinions, even taking into account the 1 which is indifferent. Even in conservative Bengal, there are 2 committees who distinctly favour the Social Conference, and there are as many as 7 who sympathize with the Conference but advise concession this year. Only 3 committees there are opposed to the Social Conference, and only 1 is indifferent."

These figures show that the temporary concession to fanatical narrowness, in the interests of internal peace, has been made, whether wisely or unwisely, to a small minority. Further, although the elements of the minority are sporadic, the main part of the excitement on the subject has radiated from Poona as far as Bombay and Satara. The discontentment, though large enough to make an unseemly appearance, will not essentially affect the energies of the Conference.

What is the true explanation of the division? Mr. Justice Ranade rejects as insufficient the very general explanation "that this excitement is due to personal differences and party quarrels." This explanation seems too obvious. "It is a characteristic of our people," says Mr. Justice Ranade, "that where a dozen people work together, one half will call the other half mad or wicked. It is our general habit to misunderstand one another. People think there is no good man among their opponents. But party differences and personal misunderstandings have never made a whole nation mad. It will not be fair to the intelligence of other places in the country of which this city boasts to be the capital to accept this explanation." Such misunderstanding and uncharitableness are, unhappily, but too common in all latitudes. Mr. Justice Ranade thinks he has found a deeper and more real cause for the peculiar fervour of Poona in this matter. He looks up and down the social history of India, and remarks that various methods of working out problems of social reform are adopted in the different parts of the country by different races. There is the method of rebellion; the method of utilising caste organisations; the method of appeal to religious feelings; the method of pledge, or sense of honour; the method of recourse to legislative aid. Now, says Mr. Justice Ranade,

"The peculiar feature of the movement in this Presidency is that we want not to work on single line, but to work on all lines together, and above all not to break with the past and cease all connection with our society. We do not proceed on the religious basis exclusively, as in Bengal. We have the different Samajas, but somehow or other there is something in our nature which prevents us from bodily moving into another camp. We do not desire to give up our hold on the old established institutions. Some might say this is our weakness, others think it connects our strength. Reform work has not been carried out in this Presidency on any one definite line, but we are trying all the methods which I have placed before you. If we were to follow any one method, our quarrels would cease. If we were distinctly prepared to stand in a camp of our own, leaving the whole community to do what they like, we might be at peace, for this is exactly what our friends the reactionist and the orthodox community are desiring us to do. . . . . We are not disposed to follow any one method, and we apply a number of methods to a number of problems, and we do desire, above all, not to occupy a separate camp for ourselves. This is, in my opinion, the chief reason why there has been so much misunderstanding and such exhibition of temper; and when you add to that personal and private differences, you will understand why the unfortunate opposition which was not offered elsewhere was exhibited in this beloved city of ours."

There can be no question but there is very solid matter in this explanation of Mr. Justice Ranade's. The difficulty, however explained, remains; and how far it may be carried, and how deeply it may be accentuated, depends on how far the dissentient minority are amenable to calm reflection and a commonsense view of concerted action on various grounds for a great common object.

The presidential address of Dr. Bhandarkar handled earnestly and impressively some of the more outstanding questions of social reform. Speaking of the proposals of the Conference as to the condition of women, he pointed out, but too truly, that "one half of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual resources of our country is being wasted." So far as the education of women is concerned, some not inconsiderable first steps have been taken. Thus, the first resolution expressed satisfaction with "the efforts that have been made by various private societies and Samajas in Calcutta, Bombay, Poona, Ahmedabad, Jallandar, and other cities, and by the Native States of Baroda and Mysore, for the promotion of higher female education" in various ways, while urging that further organised efforts should be made in the same direction. Time and tide run strong on the side of the reformers, though discretion and patience must remain steadily vigilant at the helm. The distressful illustrations of married woman's life, which were cited as common examples, ought to touch the heart and conscience of every man whose feelings have not become petrified by custom. The "ill-assorted match" of the old man and the young girl Dr. Bhandarkar condemned even more energetically than the "human sacrifice" resulting from grievous inequality of physical strength. In either class of cases, there can be no doubt but the reformers must expect strong opposition and hindrance, latent or disguised rather than openly declared. Allied with these cases is the practice of early marriage, which Dr. Bhandarkar attacked on historical and social, as well as on physical, grounds. As regards caste, a distinct reversion to the older freedom is in strong progress, fostered immensely by English example and by the social modes of intercommunication, especially the democratising railway. The preposterous way in which society has been broken up by over-driving the principle of caste is shown by the fact that one of the resolutions advocated inter-communication as regards eating and marriage-alliance between members of the subdivisions of the same caste. So much at least is necessary before the larger fragments can be gathered together into the semblance of a whole. Dr Bhandarkar carefully pointed out that the

reforms advocated by the Conference involve no break of continuity, while they are necessary to the free expansion of the energies and capacities of the people. The solid basis of his position is indicated in the following sentences:

"You will see that what is necessary in order that these reforms may come into practice is that there should spring up in our hearts a sense of justice, a keen sympathy for the sufferings of others, and a love for one's own country and race, and an anxiety for their future well-being . . . . If we ask England to remove our disabilities, we must as a necessary preliminary show that we are worthy of the favour by removing the disabilities of the oppressed classes of our society. Thus and thus alone will our country prosper. Every scheme for bettering our condition is destined to fail if it does not make provision for the growth of these sympathetic virtues, and through them for the realisation of social reform. Let us then invigorate and elevate our souls by ever placing before our mind's eye the precept of the great Indian reformer of the sixth century before Christ, the lion of the Sakya race, Gotam, the enlightened: 'Cultivate a mind boundless in sympathy for all beings as is that of the mother who protects her only son by sacrificing her own life;' and with him proclaim from this Social Conference hall, 'May all living beings, feeble or strong, lowly or great, middle-sized or short, small or large, seen or unseen, living far or near, born or to be born, be happy!'"

It is not necessary to follow the programme of discussion, but it is especially satisfactory to note the resolution in favour of the education and social amelioration of the pariahs. Altogether, though the attendance might well have been larger, the discussion shows that the Conference has planted germs of far-reaching social reform—germs that will steadily expand into beneficent growths throughout the peninsula. And the Conference and the Congress, while working separately, cannot but mingle their results, in mutual support and advancement. It is only by a more or less simultaneous advance along all lines—intellectual, moral, and political—that any real and lasting progress can be made.

A CHALLENGE FROM MADRAS.

WE have read with much interest the publications of the Literary Society of the Presidency College, Madras, for the past year. There is the Annual Report, together with two series of Lectures, and a series of Anniversary Addresses. From these papers it abundantly appears that the year 1895 has been characterised by remarkable activity on the part of the Society—an activity that forms a striking example to other places of learning and study. It is a charming feature of these lectures and addresses that the professors of other colleges, more especially those of the Christian and medical colleges, have generously co-operated with the Professors of the Presidency College. The subjects are of the most varied character; they are handled with the mastery of experts; and they are sufficiently instructive and interesting to justify their circulation far and wide among the public in pamphlet form. They take the student and the general reader outside the limits of their text-books and their ordinary range of daily interest, enlarging their mental horizon, and communicating a large and fresh impulse towards high matters of literary, scientific, social, and practical importance. We remark, with amazement, that in 1894, for the first time in the history of the Society, a social gathering was held; and, without the least surprise, that the function was repeated last year on a larger scale with markedly increased success. Undoubtedly, "considering the humdrum monotonous life an Indian student leads, unrelieved by any recreations of a social nature, an opportunity such as this afforded him of spending a pleasant evening in healthy, innocent enjoyment, cannot but be most welcome; and it is to be hoped that such gatherings will in future become an important feature of not only the Presidency College Literary Society, but also of similar students' societies." Such meetings give salt to life.

It is well worth while to turn the leaves of these Lectures and Addresses, and see the variety and treatment. The First Series contains half a dozen lectures; and it seems a pity that Mr. Edgar Thurston's lecture on methods of anthropometry as applied to ethnological research, which was delivered without writing, should not have found a place with the rest. Professor Henderson, of the Christian College, surveys "A Neglected Field in Natural History"—comparatively neglected, that is, in India—the study of the life habits of animals. There is more difficulty, indeed, in prosecuting such study in a tropical country than in a temperate region, not only from the more disadvantageous position of the observer, but from the greater tendency of the animals to shun observation. The neglect is all the more strange in India, however, where venomous snakes, for example, kill their twenty thousand human victims every year. Professor Allen, of the Presidency College, gives a bird's-eye view of the origin and development of the English Parliament; and Professor Kellett, of the Christian College, surveys Europe in the Thirteenth Century—"the Century of Organisation, of Order, and of Faith." Both these historical lectures, simple, clear, and vigorous, are worth reading here, as well as in Madras and India generally. With these we may place Professor Stone's lecture on the late Sir John R. Seeley, which happily deals, from personal experience, "rather with his unpublished teaching than with his books." "His great qualities," says Professor Stone, "were his love of truth, his desire to advance knowledge—not for its own sake (I believe he would have scorned the idea as absurd) but because of its usefulness—his strong sense of duty." Mr. Glyn-Barlow, sub-editor of the *Madras Times*, discourses very suggestively on "Nationalism and Literature," and enforces an important and true principle. "With this noble end in view, of winning glory for your people and yourselves, you will surely do well," he says, "to set before yourselves the remembrance that nationalism is a power in literature, and you will do well to make use, as materials for your work, of the things that your eyes have seen and the things that your ears have heard, and to mould them after the likeness of your hearts." Surgeon-Captain Elliot's sketch of the "Theory of Evolution" concludes with a carefully orthodox reconciliation with religion.

In the second series we find five lectures. Professor Satthianadhan, of the Presidency College, sets forth a comparison and a contrast of "Greek and

Indian Systems of Philosophy"—a very comprehensive and able discourse. The Rev. E. M. Macphail, also of the Presidency College, expounds the doctrine of bimetallism, with all the main arguments *pro* and *con*, but judiciously abstains from expressing any opinion for or against the doctrine. The other lectures are scientific. They deal with the Growth of Plants, the Value of Medicine to the State, and the problem of Heredity.

The final pamphlet contains the addresses delivered before the Presidency College Literary Society at its last five anniversary meetings. They are all marked by distinct ability and by reference to the conditions of Indian life. Professor Satthianadhan leads off with a discourse upon "Intellectual Results in India." He lays just stress upon "the intellectual, moral, and spiritual unity achieved by thought" as a cause of the development of national life. He speaks under the personal influence of Seeley, and with an elevated enthusiasm and marked fairness of tone. "In accounting for the comparative barren-"ness of the Indian intellectual field," he urges that "we should never lose sight of the barrier of "language," and of the strain of poverty; and he adduces examples to blunt the edge of Sir Lepel Griffin's sweeping assertion that he did "not "remember, in the last quarter of a century, a "single original work written by a native of India "on any subject of general, literary, political, or "scientific interest, which could fairly take rank "with productions of the second or even the third "class in England." Professor Denham, of the Máháraja's College, Mysore, speaks of "India in search of an Ideal University." Universities India has already, but *bona fide* universities are lacking to round and complete her system of education. Professor Denham reviews the university systems in Western countries, but very properly remarks that "every country will solve the great problem the "sooner and more completely only when it makes "due allowance for its history, its associations, "and peculiarities of national temperament." He wants a visible university, with equipments unattainable by individual cottages.

"This proposal for the establishment of the nucleus of a teaching university, while going a long way to remove the reproach of even less than respectable mediocrity which attaches to intellectual results in India, is one which need not interfere with the independence of the affiliated colleges. It would, however, supply wants which those colleges cannot supply, viz., a common centre of learning with all the advantages, intellectual, social, and moral, attaching thereto, including such specialised teaching as single colleges cannot command. Just as Benares and Trivadi, near Tanjore, are famous for the special study of Sanskrit, and answer the purpose of universities far more than do our so-called universities, so these common centres of learning would, in time, evolve special lines of study in those branches for which India offers peculiar facilities. In the long list of the world's universities, the Indian universities might then take, what they cannot now take by reason of their negative existence, a really creditable place."

The remaining three lectures came from the Board of Revenue. The Secretary offered a careful and able exposition of "Rome's Government of her "Provinces." The Hon. Mr. A. T. Arundel, member of the Legislative Council of the Board of Revenue, furnished a comparison and contrast of "Britain "under Rome and India under Britain." And the Hon. Mr. Sturrock, also member of the Legislative Council and of the Board of Revenue, discussed, in a strong reforming address, "The Attitude of edu-"cated Hindus towards the education of Hindu "women." No doubt, as Lord Wenlock said from the chair, "we shall have to wait very many years "before the movement is taken up as rapidly and "with as much enthusiasm as Mr. Sturrock advo-"cates." But there are signs that the movement is begun and gathering strength.

It will thus be seen that these papers cover a wide range of subjects, of practical as well as of theoretical importance. The guarantees promised by the names and positions of the speakers are found to be amply honoured in the actual achievement. The Presidency College Literary Society thus throws down a high challenge to all similar institutions, and we trust they will all have the spirit to hasten to pick up the gage.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

The Queen has been pleased to approve the appointment of Mr. Mackenzie Dalzell Chalmers as Legal Member of the Council of the Governor-General of India, in succession to Sir Alexander Miller, whose tenure of the appointment expires in April next. Mr. Chalmers has held the Birmingham County Court Judgeship since 1884. In 1894 he acted as Chief Justice at Gibraltar, and in 1895 he was appointed a Commissioner of Assize. Before accepting the County Court Judgeship, Mr. Chalmers had been Counsel to the Board of Trade, and in that capacity, and also in connexion with other Government Departments, had great experience of drafting, notably in the case of the Bankruptcy Act. Mr. Chalmers is the author of a Digest of the Law of Bills of Exchange and of a text book on the "Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881."

The "Diarist" in the *Speaker* wrote on January 18th: The appointment of Judge Chalmers as legal member of the Governor-General's Council is an excellent one, and will do something to neutralise the effect of certain other appointments that have been made recently. Mr. Chalmers is a man of exceptional ability, who has long been marked out for promotion. Indeed it was considered likely that he would be the first County Court Judge to be promoted to the Bench in the event of the barrier which at present separates the inferior from the superior courts being broken down.

Mr. Budruddin Tyabji has sent to the honorary secretary the following acknowledgment of the address from the London Indian Society, congratulating him upon his appointment as a judge of the High Court of Bombay: "I beg to thank you most sincerely for your having kindly forwarded to me the address of the London Indian Society on the occasion of my recent confirmation to the Bench of the High Court. I beg to thank the members of the Society for the extremely kind, and I must say flattering language, in which they have been pleased to express their goodwill towards me and their appreciation of whatever small merits I may possess.

Please convey my sense of gratitude to all the members of the Society, and tell them how highly I appreciate the kindness of my fellow-countrymen in England. It is to the young and energetic men now in England that India must look for her future progress in her moral, mental, and political career, and I can only say that I wish you and all others who now may be in England, all health and prosperity and the complete attainment of the noble objects which they have in view and for the sake of which they have torn themselves from their friends, relations, and country."

It was announced in the *London Gazette* for January 21st that the Queen has nominated and appointed Colonel George Fletcher Ottley Boughey, late Royal Engineers, and Major Harold Arthur Deane, Indian Staff Corps, to be Companions of the Most Exalted Order of the Star of India. The Queen has also appointed Mr. Francis Erskine Dempster, of the Indian Telegraph Department, to be a Companion of the Most Eminent Order of the Indian Empire.

It was also stated in the same issue of the *London Gazette* that the Queen has increased by two guns the salute enjoyed as a personal distinction by his Highness Sir Mahdo Singh Bahadur, Máháràja of Jaipur, G.C.S.I.

Mr. H. N. Haridas, a member of the British Committee, and the energetic secretary of the Surat Congress Committee, has during the past month given practical proof of the work which may be done by Indians in British constituencies. He has addressed a series of meetings at Belper, Derbyshire, upon simultaneous examinations, the development of the representative principle in India, the policy of trans-frontier aggression, and the separation of judicial and executive functions. Mr. Haridas has won the hearty sympathy of the Belper electors, and he proposes shortly to continue the work which he has so admirably begun.

We understand that on February 17th a paper will be read at the East India Association by Mr. Alfred Nundy on "The National Congress, its origin, aims, and objects."

The programme for the new Session of the Indian Section of the Society of Arts includes papers by Sir James Lyall, G.C.I.E., on "Punjab Irrigation"; Mr. J. H. Glass, C.I.E., Chief Engineer Public Works Department, Bengal, on "The Great Landslip at Gohna in Gurhwal, and the Measures Adopted to Prevent Serious Loss of Life"; Mr. Walter R. Lawrence, I.C.S., C.I.E., on "Kashmir: its People and its Products"; Mr. C. Tripp (formerly of Sumatra) on "The Tobacco Industry of India and the Far East"; Mr. G. W. Christison, on "Tea Planting in Darjiling"; and Captain Charles Rolleston on "The Deserted City of Hampi." Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who was Lieut.-Governor of the North West Provinces when the Gohna disaster occurred, is expected to preside at the reading of Mr. Glass's paper.

In the *Times* of January 27th the writer of "Indian Affairs" returned to the questions raised by British Indian subjects in Natal, and, with the aid of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's statistics, easily disposed of the absurd contention that the vote of the European colonists might be swamped by an ever increasing number of immigrants from British India. It seems that in Natal there are 9,309 registered voters who are Europeans while only 251 are British Indians. In other words, the European vote—thanks to a high property qualification—is thirty-seven times stronger than the Indian vote. With reference to British Indians in the Transvaal we may point out that their position is far worse than that of the European Uitlanders, on whose behalf Dr. Jameson made his raid. The Europeans are at least exempted from compulsory military service, but British Indians—not being "white persons"—are not.

There are some wiseacres who are never tired of deprecating what they describe as the introduction of Western institutions into India. If they refer to representative institutions, they merely make themselves ridiculous. As the *Times* said on January 27th, "the plea that the British Indian is unacquainted with the nature and responsibilities of representative government" will not "bear inspection." The *Times* continued: "There is probably no other country in the world in which representative institutions have penetrated so deeply into the life of the people. Every caste, every trade, every village in India had for ages its Council of Five, which practically legislated for and conducted the administration of the little community which it represented. Until the introduction of the Parish Councils Act last year there was no such rural system of self-administration even in England."

We quote, without superfluous comment, the following passage from the Jubilee number of the *Daily News*, published on January 21st:—The *Daily News* has always advocated the cause of impartial dealing with the natives of India. It has always upheld the principle that India must be governed not as a place in which Englishmen are to make money but first and foremost for the benefit of the native populations. The *Daily News* has always maintained that by such a principle alone could our dominion in India be made secure. We need not go quite so far as to insist that India ought to be governed according to Indian ideas alone, but we have always held that India must not be governed, and indeed cannot be governed, without the fullest regard for Indian ideas. That, as we have already shown, was the principle strenuously and continuously advocated in these columns by Harriet Martineau. Such opinions were not fashionable or popular then; they have made immense progress between that time and this.

How comes it that early official information, especially about Indian affairs, is so apt to find its way into the columns of the *Times*? Last year some questions were asked in the House of Commons upon the premature communication to the *Times* of the conclusions of the Opium Commission, with the result that the Secretary to the Commission received a severe rebuke. On December 26th last the *Times* printed an evidently inspired article upon the Pamir Boundary Commission, including a sketch map which showed the boundary. Similarly, a fortnight ago the *Times* accurately foreshadowed in a leading

article the measures which Sir James Westland afterwards introduced for the readjustment of the cotton duties. It would appear that the *Times* is, in some respects, in touch with official sources which are not equally open to other newspapers. We submit that, if this is the case, the matter is of importance not merely to journalists but also to the public. The opinions and prejudices of the *Times*, and its mode of dealing with certain subjects—as, for example, Dr. Jameson's raid—are not such that the British public can willingly permit it even to seem to obtain the position of their official mouthpiece.

At the Empire of India Exhibition last year, as we learn from a report just issued, the directors are in a position to state that, from the actual percentages paid to them by exhibitors, the total sales of Indian goods were between £50,000 and £60,000, and they believe that incidental outside business, done on orders secured in the Exhibition, equalled at least another £25,000; or, in brief, that the Empire of Indian Exhibition of 1895 benefited Indian trade by a sum not to be calculated at less than £75,000. The directors express their pride that such favourable results have been achieved by a private company without any financial assistance from Government or State recognition of any kind.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

ELEVENTH SESSION.

"A BRILLIANT SUCCESS."

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTIONS.

(From Our Special Correspondent.)

Poona, *January 4th.*

The Eleventh Congress has passed off most successfully. Whatever fears may have been entertained as to the possibility of faction and division, they were not realized. The Congress was, on the contrary, a brilliant success.

We had well-nigh 1,600 delegates—400 more than the number at the Madras Congress. The local delegates mustered strong, but the number from outside Provinces was also very satisfactory. To-day's newspapers will give you a brief report of the three days' sittings. The speech of the President has been most favourably received in India by the Anglo-Indian press. Those who hoped that he would indulge in tirades and denunciations have been disappointed. Mr. Banerji had conceived the whole address in a spirit of splendid moderation. The matter and the manner of it were alike excellent. It occupied nearly three hours in delivery. Every word of it was orally repeated without a single moment's reference to the text—such is Mr. Banerji's marvellous memory. It was fortunate that we had the advantage of the presence of our friend, Mr. Manomohan Ghose, who had just arrived from England, and from whom we heard the latest news with reference to Indian affairs in England. He spoke on the separation of executive from judicial functions. In the brief space of time allotted to him he brought out all the salient points of the controversy. His speech made an excellent impression on the audience, though it must be said frankly that the delegates refused to endorse his hopes of co-operation on the part of Mr. Bhownaggree. There were hisses at first at the mention of Mr. Bhownaggree's name, until the President cried "Order!" Mr. Ghose's speech has already been put into pamphlet form. Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee, who is a general favourite, spoke with his usual sound sense and vigorous reasoning on the Jury Bill. Mr. P. M. Mehta made no speech. After the indictment he had hurled only a week before on the Bombay platform against the opponents of the Congress movement he refrained from attacking further his defeated antagonists. Mr. D. E. Wacha spoke to two resolutions. The first referred to military expenditure, on which Mr. Wacha controverted some further mis-statements of Sir James Westland's, and refuted the suggestion that savings might be looked for in the near future from improved exchange. The gist of his argument was that exchange was an unstable factor to depend upon, and that if permanent economies were to be made in Indian finances there must be a reduction of the overgrown civil and military expenditure. Exchange was a precarious factor, and financial statesmanship would never warrant reliance on sources of income and heads of expenditure of a precarious character like the opium revenue and exchange respectively. Mr. Wacha also spoke on the import duties. He observed that it remained to be seen how the cotton duties could be repealed in face of the crying complaint touching the enhanced duty on salt, which must on every ground claim priority. The cotton duties, he contended, could only be repealed by first disallowing the compensation allowance and by doubling the income-tax.

The Congress afterwards considered a set of draft rules. But as these were prepared on the eve of the Congress, and as none of the Standing Committees had had leisure to examine them, it was resolved that the Committees should express their opinion fully three months before the date of the next Congress, which is to be held in Calcutta.

We also discussed the South African question. Mr. Seymour Keay spoke to a resolution on the subject of the reactionary notification issued some time ago by the Government of India gagging the press in territories under British administration in Native States. There was, of course, a resolution on the Royal Commission which condemned its sitting with closed doors, and disapproved of the limited scope of the enquiry. The speeches on this resolution were good, each speaker discounting beforehand the final report. I trust that these speeches may have due effect upon the officials of the Commission. They will, at any rate, know that we Indians are convinced that from a Commission almost entirely composed of reactionaries, and acting under the inspiration of the India Office, little good can be expected. The frontier policy of the Government was vigorously attacked in an excellent speech by Mr. H. A. Wadia, the well-known Rajkot barrister. Our friend Dr. K. N. Bahadurji, returned to his

charge against the Army Medical Service. The question of Simultaneous Examinations was taken up in an able speech by Mr. Kali Charan Banerji, an old and staunch Congress-wallah. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will be glad to see that his favourite subject was not neglected. The President also had referred to it in his speech, and expressed the hope that our "Grand Old Man" might soon re-enter Parliament. Other resolutions were passed to which I need not refer in detail. A tribute of praise was given to Sir William Wedderburn, as the indefatigable chairman of the British Committee, for his unflagging efforts in the cause of India, and for his deep and abiding sympathy with our people. The resolution was carried with all honours—all the delegates rising to their feet and cheering vociferously. As it was felt that there should be a Joint Honorary Secretary in India, the Congress unanimously appointed Mr. D. E. Wacha to the post. The appointment has given universal satisfaction, as Mr. Wacha is recognised not only as one of the most zealous fighters in the Congress camp, but also as one of the most high-minded, trustworthy, and good-natured of men.

Everywhere the impression created by this year's Congress has been most favourable. It was a success, and a grand success. With the exception of the Bombay Congress of 1889, at which the ever to be lamented Mr. Bradlaugh was present, I do not think we have had such a splendid Congress. There were present three ex-presidents of weight and authority, Messrs. Bonnerjee, Mehta, and Ananda Charlu. We had besides Mr. Ghose, fresh from England with his impressions, we had many Sirdars of the Deccan, and we had many true men and good from the different provinces. The Muhammadans who spoke, spoke well, especially the old delegate named Ali Muhammed Bhimji. The number of visitors never abated. The average was fully four thousand daily. We had as many as 150 lady visitors—Parsis, Hindus, and Europeans. The Collector, the Police Superintendent, and the District Judge were on the platform. Their names are Messrs. Silcock, Kennedy, and Crowe respectively. The President in his concluding address gracefully referred to the assistance they rendered. The Reception Committee manfully did its task, especially as to the convenience and comforts of the guests. The young band of volunteers, 300 strong, also discharged their self-imposed duties with the greatest devotion, and were rewarded by the President with compliments at once genuine and hearty. They were mostly graduates and undergraduates. The President was also presented with addresses by the students, and he made a thoughtful and eloquent reply. Everywhere he made a most favourable impression by his well-balanced utterances. He spoke strongly in favour of social reform in the Congress camp, and displayed his warm sympathy by paying a personal visit to the camp of the promoters of the Social Conference and speaking there. The speech was warmly applauded. One of the most pleasant features of the Social Conference was the presence of a large number of Hindu ladies. Another was the speech of the Muhammadan delegate to whom I have just referred. He made a capital speech on the respective duties of Muhammadans and Hindus in bringing an end to the tension caused by the deplorable riots of the past two years in the Deccan. Mr. Surendra Nath Banerji paid a high tribute of praise to the perseverance, devotion, and truly Christian spirit of Mr. Justice Ranade, who is the soul of the Social Conference.

The following is, we believe, the accurate text of the resolutions adopted by the Congress :—

Text of the Resolutions.

I.

That the draft rules in regard to the constitution and working of the Indian National Congress as framed by the Poona Congress Committee in accordance with the Resolution in that behalf of the last Congress be circulated by the Poona Committee to all the Standing Congress Committees with instructions to report to the General Secretary and Standing Counsel at least three months before the next Congress.

II.

That this Congress is of opinion that the enquiry by the Expenditure Commission will not be satisfactory to the people of this country, nor be of any practical advantage to the Government, unless the lines of policy which regulate expenditure are enquired into, and unless facilities are afforded and arrangements made for receiving evidence other than official and Anglo-Indian. And this Congress also feels that the enquiry would, in all probability, yield better results if the proceedings were conducted with open doors.

III.

That this Congress again records its firm conviction that, in view of the embarrassed condition of the finances of the country, the only remedy for the present state of things is a material curtailment in the expenditure on the Army Services and other military expenditure, Home Charges, and the cost of Civil Administration, and it notices with satisfaction that expert opinion in England has now come over to the view of the Indian Parliamentary Committee, that growth in military expenditure is a more potent cause of Indian financial embarrassment than the condition of exchange.

IV.

That this Congress again appeals to the Government of India and the Secretary of State to take practical steps for the purpose of carrying out the separation of Judicial from Executive functions in the administration of justice.

V.

That this Congress views with alarm the constant changes that are being made and threatened on the subject of trial by jury in this country, and regard being had to the fact that no demand for any such change has been made from any portion of the population of British India, trusts that the Bill now before the Supreme Legislative Council will not be further proceeded with, and this Congress, reaffirming Resolutions passed by former Congresses, also trusts that trials by jury will be extended to districts and offences to which the system at present does not apply, and that their verdict should be final.

VI.

That this Congress, being of opinion that the Government of India Notification of 25th June, 1891, in the Foreign Department, gagging the press in territories under British administration in Native States is retrograde, arbitrary and mischievous in its nature and opposed to sound statesmanship and to the liberty of the people, most respectfully enters its emphatic protest against the same, and entreats its cancellation without delay.

VII.

This Congress, concurring with previous Congresses, again records its deep regret that the labours of the Public Service Commission have practically proved void of any good results to the natives of this country, and repeats its conviction that no satisfactory solution of the question is possible, unless effect is given to the resolution of the House of Commons of June, 1893, in favour of holding the competitive examination for the Indian Civil Services simultaneously in India and England.

VIII.

In view of the great extensions of the British power on the North-West and North-East of the proper frontiers of India into regions not contemplated by Parliament when it passed Section 56 of the Government of India Act, the Congress is of opinion that over and above the sanction of Parliament necessary before the revenue and forces of India are employed outside the frontiers of India, the interests of India absolutely demand that the expenses of all such expeditions should be shared between England and India. Without some such additional guarantee, the forward military policy will involve India in hopeless financial confusion.

IX.

The Congress deems it necessary to record its most solemn protest against the disabilities sought to be imposed on Indian settlers in South Africa, and it earnestly hopes that the British Government and the Government of India will come forward to guard the interests of these settlers in the same spirit in which they have always interfered whenever the interests of their British-born subjects have been at stake.

X.

That in the opinion of this Congress any proposal to restrict the right of private alienation of lands by public Legislation as a remedy for the relief of agricultural indebtedness will be a most retrograde measure and will, in its distant consequences, not only check improvement, but reduce the agricultural population to a condition of still greater helplessness. The indebtedness of the agriculturist classes arises partly from their ignorance and partly from the application of a too rigid system of fixed revenue assessments, which takes little account of the fluctuating conditions of agriculture in many parts of India; and the true remedy must be sought in the spread of general education and a relaxation of the rigidity of the present system of revenue collections in those parts of the country where the permanent settlement does not obtain.

XI.

This Congress notes with satisfaction that the right of interpellation vested in non-official members of the Legislative Councils has, on the whole, been exercised in a spirit of moderation which has secured the approval of the authorities here and in England, and the Congress being of opinion that the practical utility of interpellations would be greatly enhanced if the members putting them were allowed to preface their questions by a short explanation of the reasons for them, urges that the right to make such explanations ought to be granted.

XII.

(*a*) That this Congress notices with satisfaction that its views in regard to the urgency and lines of reform in regard to the condition of the Civil and Military Medical services of the country are being endorsed in influential Medical and Military circles, and that in the interests of the public, Medical Science and the profession, as also in the cause of economic administration, this Congress affirms (1) that there should be only one Military Medical Service with two branches, one for the European army and another for native troops, worked on identical lines; (2) that the Civil Medical Service of the country should be reconstituted, a distinct and independent Medical Service wholly detached from its present Military connection and recruited from the open profession of Medicine in India and elsewhere with a due leaning to the utilisation of indigenous talent, other things being equal.

(*b*) This Congress further affirms that the status and claims of Civil Assistant Surgeons and Hospital Assistants requires thorough and open enquiry, with a view to the redressing of long standing anomalies and consequent grievances; and the Congress notices with regret that in their recent scheme of reorganisation of the Chemical Analyser's department, the oft-admitted claims of Assistant Chemical Analysers have been apparently overlooked by Government.

XIII.

That this Congress while fully sympathising with any genuine effort which the Government may make for the suppression of law-touts, views with grave alarm those provisions of the Bill to amend the Legal Practitioners' Act now pending the consideration of the Supreme Legislative Council which propose to invest District Judges and Revenue Commissioners with the power of dismissing legal practitioners, and in cases coming under the Act, to throw the entire burden of proving their innocence upon the latter, and this Congress being of opinion that the provisions of the Bill are calculated to prejudicially affect the independence of the Bar and to lower the position of legal practitioners in the eyes of the public without in any way helping to suppress law-touts or to further the ends of justice, urges that it should be dropped.

XIV.

That this Congress expresses its firm conviction that in the interests of the country it is absolutely necessary that there should be greater fixity in the tenure on which land is held in the temporarily

settled districts than exists at present, and that Government should impose on its own action restrictions against enhancement of assessment similar to those which it has deemed necessary in the interests of tenants to impose upon the rights of private landlords in permanently settled estates.

XV.

This Congress puts on record its emphatic protest against the retrograde policy that the Government of India have this time followed in nominating a gentleman for the Central Provinces to the Supreme Legislative Council without asking local bodies to make recommendations for such nomination, and earnestly hopes that Government will be pleased to take early steps to give to the Central Provinces the same kind of representation that it has already granted to Bengal, Madras, Bombay, and the North-West Provinces.

XVI.

That this Congress repeats its protest of the last two years against the grant of Exchange Compensation Allowance to the undomiciled European and Eurasian *employés* of Government, involving now an annual expenditure of over a crore and a half of rupees.

XVII.

That this Congress, while thanking the Government of India for recognising the grievances of railway passengers in their recent resolutions on the subject, desires to express its hope that Government will take effective steps to bring about their redress.

XVIII.

This Congress is of opinion that the action of the Forest Department under the rules framed by the different Provincial Governments prejudicially affects the inhabitants of the rural parts of the country by subjecting them to the annoyance and oppression of forest subordinates in various ways, which have led to much discontent throughout the country. The objects of forest conservancy as announced in the resolution of 1894, are declared to be not to secure the largest revenue, but to conserve the forest in the interest, chiefly, of the agricultural classes and of their cattle. The existing set of rules subordinates the latter consideration to the former, and an amendment of the rules with a view to correct this mischief is, in the opinion of the Congress, urgently called for.

XIX.

That this Congress tenders its thanks to the Secretary of State for India for his promise of September last to take an early opportunity to reduce the salt duty, and, concurring with previous Congresses, once more places on record its sense of the great hardship which the present rate of salt taxation imposes upon the poorest classes of the country, a hardship which renders it incumbent on Government to take the first opportnnity to restore the duty to its level of 1888.

XX.

That this Congress is emphatically of opinion that it is inexpedient in the present state of education in the country that Government grants for Higher Education should in any way be withdrawn, and, concurring with previous Congresses, affirms in the most emphatic manner the importance of increasing public expenditure on all branches of education and the expediency of establishing technical schools and colleges.

XXI.

This Congress is of opinion that the objection taken by Lancashire manufacturers to the exemption of Indian yarns below twenties is not well-founded, and trusts that the Government of India will stand firm in its policy of levying import duties for revenue purposes, as such levy does not conflict in any way with principles of free trade.

XXII.

That this Congress concurs with its predecessors in strongly advocating :—

(*a*) The raising of the income tax taxable minimum from 500 to 1,000 rupees :

(*b*) Persistent pressure by the Government of India on all provincial administrations to induce them to carry out in its integrity the excise policy enunciated in paragraphs 103, 104, 105, of the despatch published in the *Gazette of India* of March, 1890, and the introduction of a simple system of local option in the case of all villages ;

(*c*) The introduction into the Code of Criminal Procedure of a provision enabling accused persons in warrant cases to demand that instead of being tried by the magistrate they may be committed to the Court of Sessions ;

(*d*) The taking of immediate steps to improve the lot of the poorer classes in India, fully fifty millions of the population—a number yearly increasing—dragging out a miserable existence on the verge of starvation, and several millions actually perishing, in every decade, by starvation.

(*e*) A modification of the rules under the Arms Act so as to make them equally applicable to all residents in, or visitors to, India without distinction of creed, caste, or colour : to ensure the liberal concession of licences wherever wild animals habitually destroy human life, cattle, or crops : and to make all licences, granted under the revised rules, of lifelong tenure, revocable only on proof of misuse, and valid throughout the provincial jurisdiction in which they are issued;

(*f*) The establishment of military colleges in India, whereat, natives of India, as defined by statute, may be educated and trained for a military career, as commissioned or non-commissioned officers (according to capacity and qualifications) in the Indian army ;

(*g*) The organising throughout the more warlike races of the empire of a system of militia service ;

(*h*) The authorising and stimulating of a wide-spread system of volunteering, such as obtains in Great Britain, amongst the people of India ;

(*i*) The regulation of the imposition of the Water-cess by certain defined principles affording security to the rights of landowners and of persons investing money in land ;

(*j*) The giving effect to the report of the Parliamentary members of the India Office Committee on the subject of the Rules, Orders, and Practices in Indian Cantonments, with regard to prostitution and contagious disease, and the endorsing of their conclusions :—

(i) That the system and incidental practices described in that Report, and the statutory rules, so far as they authorised or permitted the same did not accord with the plain meaning and intention of the resolution of the House of Commons, of June 5th, 1888; and

(ii) That the only effective method of preventing these systematic malpractices is by express legislation.

XXIII.

That a sum of Rs. 60,000 be assigned for the expenses of the British Committee and the cost of the Congress publication India, and that the several circles do contribute as arranged, either now, or hereafter in Committee, for the year 1896.

XXIV.

That this Congress hereby tenders its most grateful thanks to Sir W. Wedderburn and the other members of the British Congress Committee for the services rendered by them to India during the present year.

XXV.

That this Congress re-appoints Mr. A. O. Hume, C.B., to be its General Secretary for the ensuing year.

XXVI.

That the Twelfth Congress do assemble on such day after Christmas Day, 1896, as may be later determined upon, at Calcutta.

"A MEANS OF LEARNING SOMETHING."

The *Manchester Guardian* (December 31st) wrote:— The annual meetings of the Indian National Congress, which is sitting this week at Poona, always have a remarkable effect on a large part—at least one-half—of the English political press. Perhaps it is because the meetings are not very fully reported. At any rate the reporters' notes are not accepted as evidence. The custom is rather for the leader writer to frame an imaginary Indian National Congress of his own and to discuss gravely the attributes with which it is endowed by himself. At the same time he frames a second imaginary Congress with entirely different attributes, and he solemnly or ironically lectures others for entertaining this vision. The vision which our Conservative journals firmly hold to be a reality seems to be that of a mass meeting of the Bengali Babus of Anglo-Indian fiction, talkative, greedy, and insincere, who agitate for universal suffrage in India with a view to their own political promotion and the undermining of pure and equal British administration in India. With this intelligent conception kept well in view, the British public is warned not to trust the assurances of those who represent the Congress movement as the final expression of the views and aspirations of all the peoples of India. For, to go no further, how can a body of Bengali Babus represent the Muhammadans of India, to say nothing of all the distinctions of Jains, Sikhs, Parsis, Marathas, Madrasis, and the rest? The weak points of this piece of teaching, which is delivered annually in almost the same terms, are, first, that the Congress is not what these writers imagine it to be, and, secondly, that the conception of it which they criticise as if it were the only alternative is not entertained by any intelligent person in this country or in India. The Congress, as a matter of fact, represents the political opinions of many of those natives of India who have leisure, English education, and a lively interest in politics—represents them, as it has been very well said, much as the Social Science Congress or the British Association represents the body of public opinion that is most keenly interested in social problems or scientific progress. No doubt millions of Indians have scarcely heard of it, and other millions have heard of it without any particular interest; it is so obvious that the Congress is not formally accredited by the whole body of Indian citizens that time should not be wasted in pointing the fact out. But that does not deprive its proceedings of interest and value. It is the constant lament of Indian officials that the minds of the people they govern are almost impenetrable to the individual European. It is one of the main difficulties of Indian administration that it is carried on in a kind of twilight in which the sharpest-sighted Europeans can sometimes be scarcely sure that what they offer as a helping-hand will not be mistaken for a threat or a blow. Well, here at least is a means of learning something. It has been our policy to put a vast number of Indians, Hindu and Muhammadan, in the way of obtaining an education and the means which it offers of formulating and expressing opinions and feelings. When they make use of the means which have been afforded them, only the very dullest politician would ignore the indications thus given of the thoughts that are current in the minds of at least a large number of Indians, and those the Indians who are best equipped to influence their countrymen. Here we have been debating for nearly a year the Chitral affair and the whole question of Indian foreign policy which it involves, and every third word in the discussion on both sides has implied some assumption as to native Indian feeling. The forward party have been appealing to the Government not to damage British prestige in native eyes. We ourselves have been far more afraid of damaging this country in the eyes of India by guarding against fanciful dangers at the cost of oppressive taxation. When we are all assuming that India thinks something, and implying that the nature of her thoughts is of extreme importance in the framing of our policy, we should surely not ignore the few opportunities there are of finding what any part of the population does think. On Saturday the Congress condemned the occupation of Chitral, and no doubt the full report will show that impatience of the financial burdens imposed by the forward policy was the feeling that led to this vote. Of course such a

vote has not the value of a *referendum* vote taken throughout British India on the question. It does not represent everything. Still is represents something, and it probably represents a great deal, for it would be extravagant to suppose that the educated and politically active Indians who man the Congress have in some strange way isolated themselves from the mass of their countrymen and adopted opinions not generally current among those for whose support they appeal. A great deal of rather cheap ridicule has been spent on the Congress movement in favour of representative government. There would be less if it were known how small an interval separates the reforms which have been actually adopted and proposed by the Indian Government from those for which the Congress asks. The election of representatives on the Provincial Legislative Council in Bengal by the municipalities of each division differs very little from the schemes of representation, usually through the medium of electoral colleges, which the National Congress "agitators" have put forward during the last few years. We do not exclude the elective system in India now, and the Congress does not ask for its indefinite extension. There is a strong feeling in this country that though the complete subjection of India to British rule has been more beneficent than its earlier subjections to selfish or ignorant tyranny, still the subjection has been too complete to satisfy the conscience of a country which has made perfect self-government its own political ideal. No sane person overlooks the difficulty of making self-government on a great scale work well in India. But it is the direction in which we must tend, and by educating the natives of India we are teaching them to look in that direction too. Meanwhile, if proper attention is given to such expressions of Indian opinion on specific questions as are audible even now serious trouble may be avoided. We ought of our own motion to have refrained from saddling the Indian taxpayers with a part of the cost of English and Irish garrisons under the head of "Home Charges" for the Indian army. We ought not to have made India pay for the India Office in London when we did not venture to make the colonies pay for the Colonial Office. When things like this are done in the absence of any effective representation of popular opinion, they may give to a movement in favour of political changes the bitterness of a movement of protest against extortion.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI ON THE CRISIS.

While everybody is thanking the German Emperor for revealing once more the loyalty of our colonies in times of stress and strain, it occurred to me (wrote a representative of *The Star* on January 16th) that it would be interesting to learn the views of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, who represents in a unique way the opinions and sentiments of our millions of Indian fellow-subjects.

"I can say without hesitation," replied Mr. Naoroji to my enquiries, "that the Indians would stand staunch and loyal to England—unless, indeed, some very unfortunate mistake were made by the authorities. There are undoubtedly many grave evils in the present system of administration in India, but the people of India fully understand and highly appreciate the benefits of their connection with this country. They believe also that, sooner or later, when the British public comes to be conversant with Indian affairs, the evils are sure to be remedied. It is in the long persistence of those evils that danger lies."

"There is," I said, "a large amount of fighting power in India?"

"Quite so. You have in India an amount of fighting power which England can utilise in any part of the world, and which it would be no child's play to resist. You have in the Sikhs, the Rajputs, the Marathas, and all the martial races, Hindu or Muhammadan, a warlike breed of some thousands of years. Its total strength is not far short of two-thirds of the whole fighting power of Europe. Lord Beaconsfield seemed to understand this, and it was a good stroke to bring Indian soldiers to Malta. You have employed them in Africa, in China, and in other parts of the world. But England should pay fairly for whatever she takes from India that is to her interest. She should not throw all the burden upon India, as she does in frontier wars like Chitral, and in many other ways."

Reviews.

POOR INDIA.

The Poverty Problem in India. Being a dissertation on the Causes and Remedies of Indian Poverty. By Prithwis Chandra Ray. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink & Co. Bombay: Thacker & Co., Limited. London: W. Thacker & Co., 87, Newgate Street.)

There is now no real question whether or not India is a poor country. Everybody that has any knowledge of the facts admits that India is poor; and those that know the facts most intimately acknowledge that the poverty of India is intense and grinding, and widespread, and—what is of still more serious import—continually increasing. Mr. Ray complains, not without grounds, that the subject "has not hitherto been approached from the standpoint of practical politics, though discussions of side issues have frequently been indulged in in this quarter or that." It is just a little hard on the Indian National Congress when he says it "has done little more than pass vague and meaningless resolutions on this question." A little hard, and unjust: for the most recent efforts of the British Committee have been energetically directed, not fruitlessly either, against the most dangerous canker gnawing the roots of Indian prosperity. But we are not going to quarrel with Mr. Ray on that ground; we will content ourselves with remarking that he ought to have known better. As Sir Romesh Chunder Mitter says, in an introductory letter to the author, "in the range of Indian politics there is no subject which is of more vital importance this. . . . on a practical solution of this

Problem our political advancement chiefly depends." Whether the remedies suggested by Mr. Ray would prove effective or not—and we shall presently see what they are—we can at any rate agree with Mr. Justice Mitter that he has "done a great service by clearly setting forth the nature of the disease with which we have to grapple." This, in fact, was done years ago, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in the most convincing manner, when he whipt Sir Grant Duff so exemplarily in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review*. Mr. Ray's welcome volume will, we trust, draw fresh attention to the all-important and pressing question.

India is substantially a land of agriculturists. The country, it may be said, is the peasantry. Even Sir Charles Elliott, who will not be suspected of conspiracy with the Indian National Congress, did "not hesitate to say that half of our agricultural population never know, from year's end to year's end, what it is to have their hunger fully satisfied." And "half of our agricultural population" means something like 100,000,000 of men, women, and children. Mr. Ray cites numerous testimonies. Let the following suffice:

> "The late Agricultural Reporter to the Government of Madras, Mr. Robertson, says of the Indian peasant in general: 'In the best seasons, the gross income of himself and his family does not exceed 3d. per day throughout the year, and in a bad season their circumstances are most deplorable.' Less than 8s. for a whole family for a month! An English day labourer or a factory operative would earn more than that in a week, working for a much shorter time. And when we remember that, however cheap living may be in India, it cannot be managed under the most favourable circumstances at less than Rs.2-8 a month per head, and that an average Indian family consists of 5·4 persons, as revealed in the last census, it is really a puzzle to understand how they can make the two ends meet. But alas! the two ends never meet, for even in the best of times, according to the most reliable authorities, 40,000,000 people always remain on the actual verge of starvation!"

No matter what deductions may be made, within the widest reason, from these appalling estimates, there must nevertheless remain a heart-breaking amount of misery from sheer hunger and the inevitable sickness consequent upon hunger. Why is it so? Mr. Ray sets forth a series of reasons. Excess of population, say some. Well, India is somewhat more densely populated per square mile than France; but it is less densely populated than Germany, Italy, and China, much less densely than Holland, and not nearly half so densely as England or Belgium. But, it must be admitted, the average is deceptive. For in some localities there is fearful congestion: "the density of population varies from 930 to the square mile in Northern Behar to 4 in Upper Burmah." The excess, where there is excess, lies in inequality of distribution; and, in view of the attachment of the people to their own districts, the remedy is by no means easy. Another cause is alleged to be the high cost of living, resulting from exportation of staple food-grains. Rice, the staple food-grain of about a third of the Indian people, is stated by Mr. Ray to be about four times as dear as it was half a century ago. At the same time, wages and agricultural profits have not increased proportionately. Again: "Our peasantry are being ground down under the cruel exactions of the intermediary revenue collectors whom our Government has created and fostered." Then there is the extortionate enhancement of rent on every fresh Settlement—a practice that has driven the people to riot in some places, and that has been strongly deprecated by high official authorities. "Taking a defaulter's family at only 4 on an average, we find that about 3,250,000 people, or one-eighth of the whole agricultural population of the Madras Presidency, have been sold out of house and home within the course of only eleven years, and for the simple offence of their having been unable to meet the high land revenue demands of the Government!" How much better are the other provinces? Dr. Voelcker charges the Indian agriculturist with want of enterprise. Others point to extravagance in weddings or *sradh* ceremonies, indiscriminate charity, and the joint family system, habits of drinking, eternal litigation, floods, droughts, and blights, and so forth. Mr. Ray reviews history, and finds that the Indian rayat has always been poor, and that under British administration his poverty has only deepened. We summarise Mr. Ray's remedial proposals:

1. Fix the land revenue in perpetuity universally, and check the growth of landlordism.
2. Raise the status of the peasantry by giving them some such additional rights as were conferred by the Irish Land Laws from 1870 downwards.
3. Establish agricultural banks in all mportant rural and urban centres.

Relieve congested districts by migration or emigration—especially by founding a colony "somewhere within the Empire"; and place effectual checks "upon the unreasonable multiplication of the peasant classes."

5. Spread around knowledge of agriculture. Let the Government start more works of irrigation, drainage, and embankments.
6. Revivify the *panchayet*, and introduce a Poor Law.
7. Readjust and reduce taxation, direct and indirect.

These proposals, on their very face, suggest abundant points of criticism, but we leave the reader to see for himself what Mr. Ray has to say about each of them.

Mr. Ray's first chapter is devoted to a polemic against free trade in favour of protection. He has put his weakest foot first. On this head we must hold him to be completely mistaken. His second chapter deals in a very interesting way with "Indian Arts and Manufactures," but it is vitiated by a strong admixture of protectionist ideas. We have just dealt with his valuable third chapter, and now pass on to the final chapter, in which he considers

Insect Bites or Stings, Chafed Skin, Piles, Cuts, Sore Eyes, Sunburn, Earache, Neuralgic and Rheumatic Pains, Throat Colds, and Skin Ailments, Quickly Relieved by use of

CALVERT'S
CARBOLIC OINTMENT.

Large Pots, 1s. 1½d. each (English Rate).

Keeps good in any Climate—Free from Animal Fat.

"One of the girls in my school was badly bitten by a wasp. and the place was swollen the size of an egg. In less than three minutes your Ointment caused the swelling and pain to disappear."—*Guildford.*

PRIVATE REPORT FROM LIMASSOL, CYPRUS—"I have never found anything to come up to it for Neuralgic and Rheumatic pains."

Numerous other favourable reports have been received.

F. C. CALVERT and CO., MANCHESTER.

certain "immediate causes" of the poverty of India. "The incidence of taxation—herein lies the greater canker. It is at once both unequal and insidious, and is sufficient to condemn 'the yoke of the foreigner'." The salt tax, which ranks next to land revenue in yield, is admittedly a most serious grievance. "Upon every seer of salt he consumes the agriculturist or the labourer has to pay a duty of one anna clear. . . . . A sense of deep wrong is rankling in the hearts of our plebeian class, which it is not entirely safe to ignore." The income tax hits the poorer middle class, with incomes over Rs. 500 a year; and perhaps three-fourths of all those that fall under the tax have incomes ranging from Rs. 500 to Rs. 1,000 a year. But "if one were to compare the expenses of an Englishman with £150 a year (less than this is not taxed in England) with those of a Hindu with Rs. 500, it will prove very much to the disadvantage of the latter." The land tax "is being daily increased by fleecing our agricultural population"; this has already been referred to. Further, says Mr. Ray:—

"Our Government can lay no moral claim upon our land, for the security to life and property it pretends to confer upon our agricultural population is a mere statute-book security, it being almost powerless to check the tremendous growth of the spirit of lording it over to be met with everywhere in the country. An English cultivator is satisfied to get his money's value in the shape of the strong protection which he receives from the hands of those to whom he pays his taxes, so much so that the fact that his house is his castle has almost passed into a proverb. And here, after a century and a half of English rule, the lower classes find that they are more helpless now than they ever were before. In order, therefore, to justify this tax, our Government must make the landowning classes and the Anglo-Indian community feel that no violent hand can ever be laid, not only in the light of day, but also in the darkness of night, upon either the person or the purse or the possessions of the rayat with impunity."

Mr. Ray pronounces a justly severe condemnation on the extravagant military expenses. He also complains of the heavy cost of the Civil Services, and finds it "impossible to condemn in too strong terms the reckless way in which public money is spent" in the Public Works Department. As to the latter, "underhand jobbery and thoughtless waste are almost everyday affairs under its ægis. Lord Mayo characterized some of the expenditure of this department as 'a recklessness little short of robbery'."

The first thing to be done, no doubt, is to limit expenditure rigorously at all points, where this is possible without cramping the energies of the country. At the same time, there is required a firm hand upon the spirit of frontier policy and military adventure. The next thing is the guidance of the forces thus conserved into the direction of material development of the country. Given a prosperous population, the finances would soon recover their elasticity. If the obvious and wise policy were once thoroughly in train, not only would poverty soon disappear from the land, but there would be an opening for English trade and English enterprise absolutely astonishing. When will English constituencies open their eyes to the selfish view of Indian poverty? If they could but see the possibilities of trade open to them with a prosperous India, surely they would promptly make an end of frontier expeditions and "ignoble little wars," and insist on a government of India in accordance with the principles of justice and reason, which at the same time would bring prosperity to India and increased prosperity to England.

A GUJARATI GRAMMAR.

The Students' Gujarati Grammar, with Exercises and Vocabulary. By G. P. Taylor, M.A., B.D., Irish Presbyterian Mission, Gujarat. (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., Ltd.)

"The Students' Gujarati Grammar," compiled by Mr. G. P. Taylor, will be welcomed by European students who wish to learn Gujarati in these days when the importance of the Indian vernaculars is widely recognised. Nearly a score of Gujarati grammars have been written since the beginning of the present century for the English student, and, though most of them have individual merits, the need has long been felt for one that might enable him to begin the study of the language without the aid of a teacher. That the present volume will be regarded as a text-book, there can be little doubt. The author has lived for many years in Gujurat, freely mixing with all classes of people, and has had advantages which preceding writers could not enjoy. The plan of the book is commendable. Mr. Taylor has succeeded in securing accuracy and simplicity, and has given a great deal of useful and interesting information in the limited space at his disposal. The seven appendices and five paradigms that precede the exercises and vocabulary will be found useful.

BIBLIOGRAPHY of ARTICLES in MONTHLY and QUARTERLY MAGAZINES on INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JANUARY, 1896.

Indian Magazine and Review (A. Constable and Co., 14, Parliament Street, S.W.). Gaikwad, Shrimânt Sampatrao, "Travel." Pope, Dr. G. U., "Leaves from an Old Indian's Note Book." "Sketch of a Travancore Girls' School."

Minster. Temple, Sir R., "Some Great Men in India."

Pall Mall Magazine. Forrest, G. W., "Calcutta."

Westminster Review. White, Col. S. Dewe, "My First Battle in the Indian Mutiny."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

JANUARY, 1896.

Montgomery, Edmund W. ...."Indian Railway Companies, 1896." (Fred. C. Mathieson and Sons, and Effingham Wilson, London) ....

Burrows, Montague ...."The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain." (Wm. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh.) .. 12s. 0d.

"Report of the Empire of India Exhibition, 1895." Illustrated. (Printed by Spiers and Pond) .. — —

An (Anglo-Indian) Optimist ...."Essays *Fin de Siècle*." (Allahabad, the *Pioneer* Press) .. — —

Beynon, Lieut. W. G. L. ...."With Kelly to Chitral." Illustrated. (Edward Arnold) 7s. 6d.

Gray, John Alfred, M.B. ...."At the Court of the Amír." (Richard Bentley and Son) .... 16s. 0d.

Gribble, J. D. B. ...."A History of the Deccan," Vol. I. (Luzac and Co.) .. 21s. 0d.

Printed by A. Bonner, 1 & 2, Took's Court, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.